THE DATE AND AUTHORSHIP OF 'JACKE JUGELER.'

IN vol. I, p. 202, of Arber's *Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London*, 1554–1640 A.D. (corresponding to fol. 85 b of Register A), occurs the following entry:

> Recevyd of William Coplande for his lycense for pryntinge of an interlude intituled Jack Juggeler and mistress Boundgrace .....iiij^{d}.

The part of the Register in which this occurs extends from fol. 84 a—92 a, and is headed 'ffor Takynge of ffynes for Copyes as folowethe.' This again is part of the 'accompte made by.....Wardens of the Companye of Stacioners of all such sommes of monye as hathe comme to theare handes from the xxijth Daye of July Anno 1562 unto the xxij of July Anno 1563 which is by the space of one hole yere as folowethe.'

The 'accompte' for the 12 months fills fol. 82 a—fol. 96 b.

The entry of the payment for *Jack Juggeler* is 36th out of 124. Five entries back is one 'Recevyd of garrard Dewes for his lycense for pryntinge of a pycture of [a] monsterus pygge at Hamsted...iiij^{d}.'

Arber's note on this is, 'the broadside is entitled *The description of a monstrous pig, the which was farrowed at Hamsted besyde London, the xvi day of October, the present yeare of our Lord God,* MDLxij.'

This, and its comparatively early occurrence (the lists were not alphabetical), suggest that the entry about *Jack Juggeler* belongs to the year 1562. No. 53 was a payment in respect of *Crestenmas Carroles*. This again points to 1562. It may be added that William Copland issued books with his imprint from 1548 to 1561 (*D. N. B.*).

We may therefore conclude that an edition of *Jack Juggeler* was probably published in the year 1562. The two loose leaves in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire may have belonged to this edition, as the spelling is much later than that of the complete copy, which we shall see reason to believe was written between 1547 and 1552.

It is evident that the play cannot have been written before 1547 from the use of the word 'bedlem,' which occurs twice, viz. in l. 498:

This bedlem knaue without dought is mad

and in l. 975:

Nor a more frantike mad knaue in bedelem.

We know that the building of the dissolved priory of St Mary of Bethlehem was given to the City of London as an hospital for lunatics in the year 1547, before which the word 'Bedlam' could have had no association with madness.

The lower limit is a more difficult question, and depends on the relation of *Jacke Jugeler* (as it will now be spelt when referring to the older edition), and *Ralph Roister Doister*.

We may assume that *Ralph Roister Doister* was written in 1552. It is not necessary to discuss the question here, but the reasons for this assumption may be found in the introduction to the edition of the play in the Temple Dramatists (ed. Williams-Robin), pp. v—vii.

What reasons are there for believing that *Jacke Jugeler* was written before *Ralph Roister Doister*?

Whether written by the same person or not, there is evidently a close connexion between the two plays in method, characters, and language.

(*a*) *Method.* Both adapt episodes from Latin comedy to the environment of Tudor London, and embody more or less literal transcripts from Plautus. The prologue of *Ralph Roister Doister* is either a condensed paraphrase of the prologue of *Jacke Jugeler*, or the latter is an expansion of the main points of the former.

(*b*) *Characters.* Mayster Boungrace corresponds to Gawyn Goodlucke, Dame Coye to Christian Custance, Jacke Jugeler to Mathewe Merygreeke, Jenkyn Careawaye to Truepenie, Ales trype and go to Tibet Talk apace.

(*c*) *Language.* Among the more obvious resemblances of language may be noted:

Jacke Jugeler.	Ralph Roister Doister.
69 you shal here a thing y^{t} onlie shal make you merie & glad.	I, i, 59 I can when I will make him mery and glad.
137 my cosune Careawaie.	III, i, 4 my cousin Roister Doister.
148 by cokes precious potstike.	III, iv, 127 by cocks precious potsticke.
228 she swimmeth to and fro.	II, iii, 46 ye shall see hir glide and swimme.
317 saint Gorge y^{e} boroue.	IV, viii, 45 sainct George to borow.
318 ieopard a ioynt.	IV, viii, 17 ieoparde my hande.
348 who lustith to feale shall find his hart creping out at his heele.	III, iii, 96 I might feele your soule departing within an inche of your heele.

430 *In nomine patris.*	I, iv, 49 *Nomine patris.*
486 Truce for a whyle.	IV, viii, 33 truce for a pissing while or twaine.
496 beate on mee, tyll I stinke.	IV, iii, 120 I shall cloute thee tyll thou stinke.
593 by gods precious.	IV, viii, 40 by cocks precious.
615 well curryed.	I, iii, 77 a curried cote.
640 let me alone.	I, ii, 175 lette me alone.
726 this wagepastie.	III, ii, 10 a little wagpastie.
731 the matter lyeth gretylie me a pon.	I, iv, 9 this lieth vpon his preferment.
861 I shall rape thee.	III, v, 93 rappe you againe.
976 hence to Jherusalem.	IV, vii, 60 hennes to grece.
1013 cal y^{e} other his good maister.	IV, vii, 100 be good maister to her.

If these resemblances are allowed to establish a *prima facie* probability of connexion between the two plays, whether written by the same person or not, which of the two is more likely to have been written before the other?

Jacke Jugeler is a one-act farce on the lines of Heywood's interludes, with three scenes (vv. 84—601, 602—773, 774—992), and five characters, needing only three or four performers (if the prologue and the epilogue were recited by one), the parts being distributed thus:—(1) Careaway, (2) Jugeler and Dame Coye, (3) Ales and Mayster Boungrace; or, (1) Careaway, (2) Jugeler and Ales, (3) Dame Coye, (4) Mayster Boungrace. The time of the action is only an hour, and the place is unchanged.

Ralph Roister Doister is a regularly constructed comedy of five acts, subdivided into numerous scenes, with thirteen characters, requiring as many as ten actors, even if some of the minor parts are combined. The time required for the action is two days. The place, as in *Jacke Jugeler*, need not be changed, the scene being laid before Custance's house, but the characters are more elaborated and individualised than their somewhat sketchy and conventional counterparts.

Which of these then is likely to have preceded the other in order of time, the outline or the finished work? If they were both written by the same person, probability almost becomes certainty. In that case *Ralph Roister Doister* can no more have preceded *Jacke Jugeler* than the full corn in the ear can precede the blade, or the fruit the blossom. Was then *Jacke Jugeler* written by the author of *Ralph Roister Doister*?

The verbal resemblances between *Jacke Jugeler* and *Ralph Roister Doister* would not by themselves prove that the two pieces were composed by the same hand. The author of the one play may have copied from the other. But if we find striking similarities of language between *Jacke Jugeler* and the non-dramatic works of the author of *Ralph*

Roister Doister, the identity of authorship becomes much more probable. Such are:

Jacke Jugeler.	Udall's Prose Works.
42 And Cicero Tullius.....in that his fyrst boke which he wrot, and entytulid, of an honest mans office.	*Apophthegmes*, f. 279, '*Marcus Tullius* in y^e^ thirde booke of that his werke entitleed, *de officiis*, (that is to saie, of honeste behauour, or, how eche manne ought to vse and to demeane hymselfe.'
85 Rest you merye.	*Floures*, '*Amice salue.* Good felow god you saue, or, o louynge frend god rest you mery.'
108 god before.	*Apophthegmes*, f. 152, 'For the grekes saien *σὺν θεοῖς*, with the Goddes, for that we saye in englyshe, Goddes pleasure beeyng so, or, by the wyll and grace of God, or, and God before, or, God saying amen.
145 oon faire toche.	*Apophthegmes*, f. 105, 'yea and for a faire touche.'
249 I may giue my life for halpenis three.	*Floures*, '*ego perierim*, I am vtterlye vndone, or I may gyue my lyfe for an halfepeny.'
293 arayed.	*Erasm. Par.*, *Luke* xiii, 11, 'Araied with a disease.'
615 curryed.	*Floures*, '*Verberibus caesum te*, &c. I woll all to currie the, &c.'
657 as sholde be to him a corrasiue.	*Apophthegmes*, f. 154, 'geuen no bodye a corrosif.'
674 breched in suche a brake.	*Erasm. Par. Luke*, Pref. 6 b, 'So should I in this matier stand in a streight brake.'
731 the matter lyeth gretylie me a pon.	*Floures*, '*Scin ad te attinere hanc omnem rem?* Doest thou remembre that all this matter perteyneth to the? or lyeth the vppon?'
908 fauoure your fyste.	*Floures*, '*tibi parce*, fauour or spare your selfe.'

If, in addition to these resemblances of language, we find in *Jacke Jugeler* allusions obviously autobiographical, which may be explained by known facts in the life of Udall, the probability of his authorship is still further increased.

These facts are too well known to need repetition. It is enough to say that, in connexion with a robbery of silver plate alleged to have been committed at Eton during his headmastership, Udall was examined by the Privy Council in March 1541–2, and confessed that he had committed a 'heinous offence,' for which he was imprisoned in the Marshalsea. (Nicolas, *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council*, vol. VII, pp. 152–3.) In consequence of this Udall was summarily dismissed from his mastership. Yet, in spite of his confession, there are good reasons for believing that he was innocent of the graver charges brought against

him. Had they been true he would have been ruined for life. Instead of which we find him still vicar of Braintree in 1544, bearer of the Lord Privy Seal's letter to the Bishop of Carlisle, then resident at Eton, and soon in high favour at court, and associated in literary work with the Princess Mary.

A letter is extant from Udall to a patron who has been unsuccessfully endeavouring to procure his restoration to the mastership of Eton. (*Letters of Eminent Literary Men*, Camden Society, pp. 1—7.) From this we gather that his influential friend has 'susteined gret travaill, peines, and trouble in that behalf,' and that Udall wished to recover the position 'oonly of an honest purpose to discharge my debtes, and by little and little as I might to paye every man his own.' He craves to be bestowed 'to suche condition where I maye by sobre livyng bee recovered to sum state of an honest man.' He admits that he has deserved his patron's displeasure and indignation, but trusts that his offences '*humana quidem esse et emendari posse*.' If received to grace and favour he hopes that 'this your correpcion shall bee a sufficient scourge to make me, during my lif, more wise and more ware utterly for ever to eschewe and avoid all kindes of all maner excesses and abuses that have been reported to reigne in me.' He admits that, the more tenderly his benefactor had favoured and loved him, the more grievously he must take his 'lewdnes and foly,' but he hopes for the mercy and forgiveness due 'to all suche as with wholl herte and purpose of emendemente without dissymulation returne to the holsome pathe of honestee, from whiche by youth or frailtee, thei have chaunced for a tyme to swerve.' He speaks of his patron's clemency making 'of an unthrifte an honest man,' and gives examples of young men who, after being 'of a veray riottous and dissolute sorte of livynge' in youth, have become monuments 'of all frugalitee, religion, sobrietee, and holynes.' Lastly, in a sentence which seems to sum up the situation, he begs his patron to 'accepte this myn honest chaunge from vice to vertue, from prodigalitee to frugall livyng, from negligence of teachyng to assiduitee, from playe to studie, from lightness to gravitee.'

In this letter, while there is the fullest and even the most abject acknowledgment of extravagance, laxity, and neglect of duty, there is no admission of the graver offences with which he was charged.

We are confronted then with two apparently conflicting conclusions, (1) that Udall confessed his guilt before the Privy Council, (2) that he was probably innocent. How are these to be reconciled?

If *Jacke Jugeler* was written by Udall, the explanation is given in

the epilogue. In the first stanza of the epilogue we are pointedly invited to look for some ulterior significance in the play. Though the cat in the proverb had lost her eye, there was some meaning in her wink; in other words, though one cannot speak out, one may hint and suggest. No tale can be told 'but that sum Englyshe maye be piked therof out,' i.e., some modern application may be discovered.

As this trifling interlud.....may signifie sum further meaning if it be well serched.

Could anything be plainer?

It is the fashion nowadays—

That the symple innosaintes ar deluded
And an hundred thousand diuers wayes
By suttle and craftye meanes shamefullie abused
And by strength force and violence oft tymes compelled
To beliue and saye the moune is made of a grene chese
Or ells haue great harme, and parcace their life lese.

It is an old saying that might, force, strength, power, and colourable subtlety oppress, debar, overrun and defeat right. The poor simple innocent that has had wrong and injury must call the other his 'good maister' for showing him such mercy. (Cf. such phrases in Udall's letter as 'right worshipfull and my singlar *good maister*'; 'sens the tyme that your maistership, at the intercession of my good frendes, promised upon myn honest demeanure fromthensforthe to be my *good maister*'; 'bee *good maister* to me this oons'; 'I trust ye wold become *better maister* unto me.')

And as it is daylie syne for fere of ferther disprofite
He must that man his best frende and maister call
Of whome he neuer receiued any maner benefite
And at whose hand he neuer han any good at all
And must graunt, affirme, or denie, whatsoeuer he shall
He must saye the Croue is whight, yf he be so commaunded
Ye and that he himselfe is into another body chaunged.

The next stanza is still more significant, if it was written by Udall:

He must saye he dyd amysse, though he neuer dyd offend
He must aske forgeuenes, where he did no trespace
Or ells be in troble, care and meserye without ende
And be cast in sum arrierage, without any grace
And that thing he sawe done before his owne face
He must by compulsion, stifelie denye
And for feare whether he woll or not saye tonge you lye.

The reference to being 'cast in some arrearage' would be explained by passages of the letter in which Udall speaks of his 'honest purpose to *discharge my debtes*,' and says that if his patron should reject and cast him off, 'though I wer *in noo manns daunger*, yet noo man of honor or

honestee woll either receive me, or dooe for me, or favour me, or looke on me.' Again, at the end of the letter he says, 'where percase *aeris alieni magnitudo animum tuum deterret*, I doubte not, havyng your maistershippes favour and good helpe, to bee hable to shake it of within two or three yeres at the uttirmust by suche meanes as I shall declare unto your maistership if it maye please the same to heare me.'

The epilogue continues in the same marked strain:

> He that is stronger and more of power and might
> Yf he be disposed to reuenge his cause
> Woll sone pike a quarell be it wronge or right
> To the inferior and weker for a cople of straues
> And woll agaynst him so extremelie lay the lawes
> That he wol put him to the worse, other by false iniurie
> Or by some craft and subtelete, or ells by plaine teranie.

From all this we gather that some simple innocent person has been beguiled by subtlety and forced by violence to accept and affirm obvious impossibilities. Some influential personage has picked a quarrel with him, and ruined him by the dishonest or arbitrary exercise of the laws. He has been compelled to call his oppressor benefactor for sparing him, and to 'hold up his yea and nay' even to denying his own identity. Under penalty of endless trouble and misery, of being arrested for debt, and being imprisoned without hope of release, he has had to confess and to ask forgiveness for an offence of which he was guiltless, to deny what he saw done before his eyes, and to give himself the lie.

May we not fairly conjecture that this is Udall's own account of the circumstances of his dismissal? It is a significant fact that his place was filled immediately by a temporary successor, and subsequently by a Mr Tyndall, whom the Bishop of Carlisle, in acknowledging the letter conveyed by Udall from the Lord Privy Seal, calls 'your own true scholere and bedman.' Did the Lord Privy Seal want to get Udall out in order to put his own true scholar and bedeman in? Failing to inculpate him in the alleged robbery of plate, did he, partly by threats, partly by promises of paying his debts, induce him wrongfully to confess other offences which would be enough to justify his summary dismissal? Did Udall, some seven years after, finding all these promises vain, and feeling himself strong enough in court favour to defy his oppressor, resolve in this allegorical way to repudiate his fictitious confession, and to rehabilitate himself in the eyes of the public?

It only remains to add that I am indebted for the original suggestion that *Jacke Jugeler* was written by Nicholas Udall to Professor Bang.

W. H. WILLIAMS.

HOBART, TASMANIA.

NOTES ON BEN JONSON, FROM A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY COMMON-PLACE BOOK.

RECENTLY there came into my possession a common-place book containing thirty-seven poems in an early seventeenth century hand. The volume seems to date from about 1640[1], although some poems were entered obviously as late as 1660. On the fly-leaf is written the name of a former owner, 'James Gough his Booke, Anno Dom: 1654.' The most interesting feature of this volume is a group of five poems dealing with Ben Jonson.

1. The first is a poem by Alexander Gill satirizing the *Magnetic Lady*. Gifford printed this poem from the Ashmole MSS. with the following comment[2]: 'It seems to have been hastily taken down by Ashmole or his amanuensis, and in one place there is apparently an omission of a line or more. It might perhaps be rendered somewhat more intelligible by a few obvious corrections, but I have preferred presenting it to the reader just as it stands in the only copy now perhaps in existence.' On the last point, of course, Gifford proves to have been mistaken. Since this new version supplies the omission noted by Gifford, corrects in a number of places both the metre and the text, and furnishes some variant readings of interest, I give it here in full.

To B Johnson on his Magnetick Lady.

Is this y^r^ Load-stone Ben that must attract
Applause and laughter at each scene and act?
Is this the child of your bed-ridden witt
And none but y^e^ black-friers to foster it?
If to the fortune you had sent your Lady,
Mongst prentises or applewives, it may be
Your Rosy foole might have some sport begott
With his strang habit & indefinite nott,
But when as silke and plush & all the witts
Are cal'd to see, and censure as befitts;
And if your folly take not, they perchance
Must here themselves stil'd Gentle Ignorance.

[1] A large part of the volume is devoted to political events of the year 1640.
[2] *The Works of Ben Jonson*, ed. in 3 vols., vol. ii. pp. 437–8.

Foh how it stinkes! what generall offence
Gives thy prophaneness such gross impudence?
O how y^r freind Natt: Butter gan to melt
When at the pooreness of your platt he smelt
And Inigo with laughter then grew fatt
That ther was nothing ther worth laughing att.
And yet thou crazy wretch art confident
Belching out full-mouth'd oathes w^th foule intent
Calling vs fooles and rouges vnletterd men
Poore narrow soules y^t cannot judge of BEN.
Yet what is worse after three shamefull foyles
The printer must be put to further toyles
Whereas indeede to vindicate thy fame
Th' hadst better given thy pamp[h]let to y^e flame,
Oh what a strange prodigious yeare t'wil bee!
If this thy play come forth in thirtie three;
Let Domes Day rather come on newe years eve
And of thy paper plague y^e world bereave.
Which plague I feare worse than a Serjant's bitt
Worse then infection or an ague fitt,
Worse then the Astronomers Divining lipps
Worse then three suns, a comet, or eclips:
Or if thy learned brother Allestree
(Whose Homer vnto thee for Poetrie)
Should tell of raine vpon St Swithins day.
And y^t should wash our harvest quite away.
As for y^e press if thy play must come to it
Let Tho: Purfoote or John Trundle[1] do it,
In such dull characters, as for releifes
Of fires and wracks wee find in begging breifes,
And in Cap-paper let it printed bee;
(Indeede brown paper is to good for thee)
But let it then be soe Apocryphall
As not to dare to venter on a stall
Vnless of Druggers, Grocers, Chandlers, Cooks,
Victuallers, Tobacco men, & such like rookes;
From bucklers bury let it not be bar'd
But thinke not of Duck lane, or Pauls-church-yard:
But to advise thee Ben in this strict age
A Brick-kilne's better for thee then a stage
Tho[u] better knowest a grounsel how to lay
Then lay the plott or groundworke of a play;
And better canst direct to cappe a chimny
Then to converse w^th Clio or Polyhymny,
Fall to thy trade in thy old age agen,
Take vp thy trugge and trowell gentle BEN;
Let playes alone, or if thou needs will write
And thrust thy feeble muse forth into light,
Lett Lowin cease and Taylor fear to touch
The loathed stage[2], for now thou makst it such.

ALEX: GILL.

2. Gill's poem is followed by 'Bens Answeare.' This version is much more perfect than that printed by Gifford. Indeed the latter is

[1] Who lived at the sign of 'Nobody.' He was ridiculed by Jonson in *Every Man in his Humour*, I. ii.: 'Ill be gelt, and troll ballads for Master John Trundle yonder.'

[2] Referring to Jonson's *Ode to Himself*, 'Come leave the loathed stage.'

so lame in its metre that in two places Gifford found it necessary to piece out the lines with conjectural insertions.

Bens Answeare.

Doth the prosperity of a pardon still
Secure thy raging rimes, Infamous Gill?
Art Libelling? Can no Starr Chamber peeres,
The Pillory, the whip, no loss of eares
(All w^{ch} thou hadst from thence deservedly)
No degradation from the ministry,
To be Demus of thy fathers schoole,
Keepe in thy barking wit, thou bawling foole,
From thinking to stirr me? thou hast thy end,
I laugh at thee, poore retched tyke; go send
Thy blatant muse a broad, and teach it rather
A tune to drown y^{e} ballads of thy father,
For thou hast nothing left to cure his name
But tune and noyse y^{e} ecchose of his shame;
A rogue by statute, censur'd to be whipt,
Cropt, branded, slitt, & neck-stockt; go
th'art stript.

3. This is followed by a poem, 'To B Johnson on Gil's rayling,' signed 'Townly.' Gifford has printed the poem from MS. Ashmole 38 (6907) fol. 59. The version in my volume follows the Ashmole version so closely (except for spelling) that I may content myself with merely recording the few variant readings.

l. 2, rimes Ash. rayles. l. 4, Which Ash. That. l. 6, few Ash. noe. l. 15, dur'st blast his name fully knowne Ash. dar'st to blast fame fully blown. l. 17, his Ash. thine. l. 18, had Ash. would.

4. Townly's poem is followed by 'Ben: Johnsons Ode to himselfe.' This version differs in many striking ways from that printed by Jonson at the end of *The New Inne* (1631), but agrees rather closely with the version printed after Jonson's death in *Q. Horatius Flaccus*, etc. (1640), and with the version in MS. Ashmole 38, printed by Dr G. B. Tennant in his edition of *The New Inn* (1908). The repeated occurrence of this peculiar version goes to substantiate Dr Tennant's theory that it represents Jonson's first draft of the poem circulated privately among his friends: 'Such inquiry,' says Dr Tennant, 'is pertinent in view of the fact that we have two copies [now three] of a version of this *Ode* which gives evidence of its having been written in the first bitterness of disappointment upon the failure of *The New Inn*.' Dr Tennant has given very good evidence to prove his contention, yet he has overlooked, I believe, the most important evidence of all. William Strode made a Latin translation of the *Ode*, a part of which is printed by Gifford. This translation agrees not with Jonson's own printed version, but with

the version under discussion, and thus furnishes a fourth copy of the poem in its original form.

It remains for me only to record the significant variants in the version before me. L. 10, for 'weare,' read 'are' (a much better reading); l. 27, 'sweeping,' read 'sweepings'; l. 29, 'these,' read 'those'; l. 33, 'braue,' read 'new'; l. 35, 'peyces,' read 'peeres' (obviously the correct reading); l. 46, 'hath,' read 'have'; ll. 49 f., 'straine,' 'braine,' read 'straines,' 'braines'; l. 51, 'But,' read 'And'; l. 53, 'of,' read 'o're'; l. 57, 'In,' read 'To'; l. 60, 'bone,' read 'o're.'

5. This poem is followed by Thomas Carew's 'To Ben: Johnson Vpon occasion of his Ode to him selfe.' A collation reveals no important variation from the text printed in Carew's works.

The following translation of Jerome Amaltheus's *Horologium Pulvereum* suggests at once a comparison with Jonson's well-known translation of the same poem made at the request of Drummond of Hawthornden. Drummond printed the poem at the end of his *Conversations*, and Jonson included it, in a slightly different version, in his *Underwoods*. Gifford adds another version (iii. 285) with the remark: 'It matters little which we take: the version in Drummond's folio is the worst, but all are imperfect.' It is worth noting that still another version appears in *Wits Recreations* (1640: Hotten's reprint, ii. 17).

On an hower glasse.

This glass y^{t} quite runs out to runne againe
Still getting its increasing by its waine
Mee thinkes should be the body long agoe
Of some deceased Amatorio
Who in his mistriss' flames playing y^{e} flye
Was burnt to dust, & ashes in her eye
And, as alive, so dead shewes how vnblest
Poore lovers are, whose ashes find no rest.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

ITHACA, N. Y.

SOME UNPUBLISHED POEMS OF DRUMMOND FROM THE HAWTHORNDEN MSS.

(*Continued from* Vol. VI. p. 334.)

In the July number 1911 of the *Modern Language Review* a certain number of unpublished poems of Drummond from the Hawthornden manuscripts appeared. A second and final batch is here published, but in the present instance two collaborators, both interested in the poetic achievement of the Scottish laird, have joined forces after having both independently gone over the same ground.

Most of the pieces presented here for the first time are evidently relatively early productions; this is shewn by the rather cramped style, and more plainly still by the traces of dialect, which in Drummond's later and published work are hardly perceptible.

Whatever their literary value may be (in our judgment it is not inconsiderable) these early poems are undoubtedly of no little importance in the light of the Scottish poet's development.

The first piece, of considerable length, offers an example of the eclogue, on the model of the Italian poets of the Cinquecento, a genre which Drummond, in spite of his predilection for Romance models, abandoned at a later stage.

Judging from the handwriting, the spelling, and the numerous emendations in a more correct hand, this is one of Drummond's early efforts, which has undergone subsequent revision.

Eclogue.

Damon and Moeris, by a christal spring
Wher a greene sicamour did make a schade,
And fairest floures the banckes all couering,
Theer oft to stay the wandring Nymphes had made,
While woods musicians from the trees aboue
On euerye branche did warble furth ther loue,

On grassie bed all tyrd themselues did lay
To schune suns heat and passe the tedious houres,
Delyting now to see theer lambkins play
Then to weaue garlands for theer paramours.
Damon tormentet was with Amarillis
And Moeris brunt in loue of fairest Phillis.

Phillis the louliest lasse that flockes ere fed
By Tanais siluer streames, whos heaunlie eie
In chaines of gold this shephard captiue led,
Or he knew what was loue or libertie.
Sweet Amarillis far aboue the rest
Of Askloua maids estimed the best.

In curious knotes while thay theer worke adorne,
Mixing pyed dezies with sad violets,
Whit lilies with that flour which like the morne
Doth blush and beautie to the garland sets,
Damon, whom loue and woes had sore dismaid,
Thus gan to say or Loue thus for him said :

Faire Tanais Nymphes & ye Nymphes of the woods,
Which usse in schadie groues to dance and sing,
Ye Montaine sisters, sisters of the floods,
On softest sand which oft are carroling,
Heere bring your flours and this garland make faire
To set vpon my Phillis amber haire.

Do not disdaine to be a schade, sweet flours,
To fairest tresses under which doth grow
The rose and lilie far excelling yours,
The red cinabre and the milke whit snow.
About her temples when I sal you place
Them you cannot (sweet floures) they shall you grace.

Suouft winged archers & ye sea-borne queene,
In Mirrhas child if yee tooke ere delight,
If ere with flames your hart hath touched beene,
Enambushd lie you by this red and whit,
That when her lockes this coronet anademe sall part,
A hundred Cupids may steal to her hart.

Her hart then coldest Alpine yce more cold,
Mor hard, yet precious as the diamond,
The noblest conquest that with dart of gold
Loue ever made, since he culd shoot or wound.
But he that fort not darring to essay
Contents you with her eyes & ther doth play.

Now Ceres twise hath cut her yellow lockes,
The swellow twise the spring about hath brocht,
Twise hath we waind the yonglins of our flockes,
Since I alas was forc't, & al for naught,
Be cruel her to cry, weep & complaine
Vnto this montaine, forrest, riuer, plaine.

My flockes sem'd partneres of ther masters woe :
The Bell-bearer, the troupes that vsd to lead,
His usuall feading places did forgoe,
And lothing three-leu'd grasse hold up his head ;
The walkes, the groues which I did hant of yore
My fate and Phillis hardnesse seemed deplore.

The goate-foote syluans under schadie trees
Did solemnize the accents of my plent
With grones ; the watrie Nymphes with weeping
And wide spred lockes oft I haue seen lament.
Among the rest a Nymphe sueet, wanton, gay,
Rising aboue the streames thus hard I say :

Phillis, sweet honor of these suetest woods,
Wert thou but pitiful as thow art faire,
The worthiest gem of al our Tanais floods;
But as in beautie so in hardness rare
To al thes graces that so do grace the;
Ah, learne to loue, and no mor cruel be!

The flowres, the gemmes, the mettales, all behold,
The lambes, the eues, the gold spangl'd bremes in streames,
Al thes be workes of loue; the Tygresse bold
Made mild by loue her in-bred furie teames;
In heauen, earth, aire, since all where loue we see,
O, learne to loue, and no more cruel be!

In toilesome paines to wast our virgin yeares
And louelesse liue, is not to liue, but breath;
Loue is the tree which most contentment beares,
Whose fruits euen make us liue beyond our death;
Sweet loue did make thy Mother bring forth thee;
Ah, learne to loue, and no more cruel be!

Earths best perfections doth but last short time;
Riche Aprils treasure pleaseth much the eie;
But as it grows it passeth in its prime.
Thinke, & well thinke, thy beautie thus must dye;
When with wan face thow sal loke in thy glasse
Then sal thow sigh: would I had lou'd, alas!

Looke but to Cloris, louing lou'd againe,
How glad, how merillie, sche spends each daye,
Like cherful vine whom chaste elme doth sustaine,
While her sweet yonglings doe about her play;
When thow the want sal find of such a grace
Then sal thow sigh: would I had lou'd, alas!

But who is Damon whom thow suld disdaine:
The heauens on him some gifts hath euen let fal;
Gay is hee; wealth his cabane doth containe.
He loues the much, & that is more than al;
If crueltie thy loue in him deface,
Then sal thow say: would I had lou'd, alas!

Flora him lou'd, if ere in clearest brooke
Narcissus like thy face thow did admire,
As faire as thow, yet Flora he forsooke
With al her gifts, & foole did the desire.
If he his thochts againe on Flora place,
Then sal thow sigh: would I had lou'd, alas!

This said the Nymphe, & ther with al sche sanke
The clearest streame beneath, who al dismaid
At her depart come playing to the banke,
And on his face a hundred frownes bewrayed.
I lay as on whom some strange dreame makes wake,
Then homward to my cabane did me take.

The floods sal backward to ther fontaines rune;
The spring shall want its floures; the pleasant floures
On barren rockes sal grow depriu'd of sune;
The sune sal leaue the heuens tuelve shining boures;
Heuens without starres sal be; starres cease to moue;
Ere euer I my Phillis leaue to loue.

Pant doth my hart when I thinke on that day,
That fatal day, when sche with looshung haire
And whitest petticot in new borne may,
To gather floures, did to our meeds repaire,
While I did rest beneath an ancient oke,
Caring for nocht but how to fead my flocke.

I saw her rune and as sche ran me thocht
The feilds about did smyle; beside the streames
Then sat schee down, where sune to kisse her sought;
But schee with waile eclipsd his wanton beames.
I hard her breath few words, with loue and feare
To which winds, mountaines, woods, did len their eare.

Deceiu'd perchance with that most liulie hew,
A bee did hurt her lip that mad her weep,
And moisten cheekes faire flowers with sweetest dew,
Which semed to fal, but cupid did it keep;
For when rebellious harts gainstand his dart
He steeps it in thes teares, and then thay smart.

Withal sche rose, & in watrie floods glasse
Angerlie mild the litil wound to looke,
Her selff sche drest, but Kala coming was
Who made her stay, & so her mande sche tooke,
Of golden wonderes to make poore the Mead,
While on her face my hungry eyes did feed.

At sight of her $\left.\begin{matrix}\text{red}\\\text{plump}\end{matrix}\right\}$ lips blush did the rose;
To see her vaines the violets grew paile;
The Marigold her precious leaues did close,
Amazd to find her haire so farre preuaile;
The lilies in her hand apeard not whit.
Thus dazel'd was my sight with sueet delight.

Ourchargd at last sche to her village went,
Leauing a thousand diuerse thoughts in mee,
Like ciuill foes tumultuouslie which vent
All their best strenghtes till all euanish'd be.
Then tyrd with wo I laid me in my bed,
Wher al the Nyt the Hyacynthe I red.

What wonder her sueet eies culd me beguile,
Which kendle desire then when thay utter breath,
And euen when sche wald froune yet seme to smile,
Life promising when most thay threaten death!
For these faire tuines I rather stil be sad
Then by anothers loue even be made glad.

Hawthornden MSS. x., pp. 108—114.

The next of the longer pieces is likewise an eclogue in much the same style, which, however, has not been subject to revision on the author's part.

Eclogue.

Syrenus. Montanus.

Sy. While dayes bright coachman makes our schadows short,
And panting rests him in his halff dayes course;
While gladder shephards giue themselves to sport,
Let us deare Montane rest us by this source,
Wher we may stanche our thrist with coldest streames,
And under schade be freed of Phebus beames.

M. Content am I; but since Syluanus left
This earthlie round I neuer like that spring,
The wearie place from me my ioyes hath reft,
When I behold wher he was wont to sing,
Syluane well knowne, the honor of our woods,
Who made the rocks to heare & stayed the floods.

Sy. Bewaile not Syluane, since he's releu'd
Of fleschlie bonds and thes our mortal toiles,
With sad misfortunes now he is not grieuet.
This earth is framd for deaths triumphing spoiles;
The pleasant leaues, the suetest flours decayes,
And fairest things doth last the fewest dayes.

M. Th'enuyous heauens, befor the course of time,
Stole the from earth for to enrich their spheares,
While scars thow flourish't in thy youthful prime,
Filling our harts with woe, our eies with teares.
Syren, for thes deare dayes that heer thow spent,
Stay not my grief but help me to lament.

Sy. If floods of teares from the elysian plaine
Culd call a happie gost, if sighes culd giue
A sparke of lyff, then Phillis schoures of rain
And lasting grones might make him yet to liue.
Yet in remembrance of this orphane place,
And her I murne, I'l sing with the a space.

M. A stream of teares, poore riuer chrystalline,
Len these mine eies; so may along thy banks
Sueet roses, lilies, & the colombine,
In pleasant flourish keep theer statlie ranks,
To washe Syluanus Tombe, that of my sorrow
The floods, the hils, the mids, a part may borrow.

Sy. Len me the voice that Boreas hath the giuen,
Stracht reachet pin, when he his blows redoubles;
So may thy loftie head mont vp to heauen,
& neare heareafter feare his angry troubles,
That my sad accents may surpasse the skies,
& make heuens echoes answer to my cries.

M. Forests, since your best darling now is gone,
Who your darke schadows suetnet with his layes,
Teache al your nightingales at once to grone;
Cut your greene lockes; let fal your palmes & bayes;
Let not a mirtil tree be in yow found,
But eurie wher with cypress sad abound.

Sy. Faire Midows, from whos tender bosome springs
The white Narcissus, Venus deare delight,
The Hyacinth, & others who wer kings
And ladies faire when thay enioyd this light,
In mourning blake your princely coulours die;
Bow down your heads, while sighing zephires flee.

M. What now is left vnto this plane but weeping?
This litil flood, that sometime did inuite
Our wearied bodies to sueet rest and sleeping,
With his soft murmur semes to waile our plight,
Telling the rocks, the banks, wheerere he goes,
& the wyde ocean, our remedlesse woes.

Sy. As Philomela sight upon a tree,
Me thocht (for what thinks not a troublet mind?)
With her own grieues, amids her harmonie,
Syluanus death, our losse, sche oft combined,
Wherto tuo widow turtles lent theer eares,
Syne planed that Nature had not giuen them teares.

M. The earth, althocht cold winter kil her flowres,
And al her beautie eurie wher deface,
When Phebus turns into his hoter boures,
Made ful of lyff, smiles with her former grace.
But so soone as, alas, mans giuen to death,
No sunne againe doth euer make him breath.

Sy. The Moone that sadlie cheers the gloomie night,
When sche in deaths blake armes a while remaines,
New borne, doth soone recev her siluer light
And queenlike glances or the silent plaines;
The stare sunke in the west again doth rise.
But man, forgot, in vglie horror lies.

M. Ah souueraine poures, when ye did first deuise
To make poor man, why brak ye not the molde?
With fleschie maskes why did ye sprits disguise?
Caussing a glasse so foole that liquor hold,
With cryes & paine him bringing to the light.
Happie t'haue sleepe in an eternal Night.

Sy. Happie t'haue sleepe in an eternal Night,
& neuer interrup that silent rest,
He felt no woes if he had no delight;
He did not know what's euil; of nocht what's best;
If he vsd not th'vnperfyt peece of reason,
He feard not woes to come at eurie season.

M. If that I war againe for to be framd,
& that the heuens wald freelie to me giue
What of the things below I suld be made,
A hart, a doue, I rather choose to liue,
Then be a man, my losses stil lamenting,
Tost first with passion, then with sore repenting.

Sy. If I was one of yow, my sille lambes,
I suld not beene oprest with th'vncuth caires
That mankind hath, nor felt the cruel flames
Of Phillis eies, nor knowne what was despaire.
Sueet harmless flocke, when as ye stray alone,
Are ye affraid of styx or phlegeton?

M. The mids are not embled with so manie floures,
So many hews heuens neuer doth borrow,
So many drops hath not the april schoures,
As we poore wretchet men hath worlds of sorrow.
For thes, o glorious gifts of noble skies,
With bitter teares ye fillet hath our eies.

Sy. With bitter teares ye fillet hath our eies,
And fostreth with beguiling hope our mind,
With promist good that doth us stil intice.
Lo, seeke we we wot not what, and so mad blind
We follow lies and change to taste of ioyes,
But hauing changd we find but new annoyes.

M. If lies bred ioyes and vertue bring woe,
Fals thochts be ful of comfort, trewth of sadness,
Welcome braue lies of that I neuer know!
Unhappie trewth to take from me my gladness;
For thocht we weep our woes we cannot mend them,
& we may end ourselves before we end them.

x. pp. 115—119.

The two that follow are manifestly literary exercises after the manner of Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*.

Fragment.

Like unto her nothing can be namd.
The mold is broke wherin, dear, sche was framd.
Who may of her rare beautie count ich part,
And all thes gifts heauen doth to her impart,
On Affricke shores the sand that ebs & flows,
The skalie flockes that with old Proteus goes,
He sur may count, and al thes waues that meet
To washe the Mauritanian Atlas feet—
Her curlet haire, faire threeds of finest gold,
In nets & curious knots mens harts to hold;
Her forhead large & euen of which the lilies
Do borrow beautie & the daffodilies;
Faire ebaine bows aboue her heunlie eies,
Wher tratrous loue in silent ambush lies;
Well framd her nose; her cheekes with purest red,
Cinabre like, most dantelie are spred;
Prettie & schort her eares; with heunlie smiles
Her visage schind that sadest eies beguiles;
To orient perles her teeth do nothing yeild,
Nor lips to coral, or of gueles a feild.
Juno with maiestie, & faire aurore
With blush & fingers did this sueet decore;
The Graces gaue theer smiles and did reioice
To heare her sing with Phebus heaunlie voice;
Pallas gave wit; the vertews gaue theer part:
Liuing the heauen they loget in her heart. x. pp. 64—65.

Fragment.

A faire, a sweet, a pleasant heunlie creature
Lycoris was—the miracle of Nature:
Her hairé more faire then gold of Tagus streames,
Or his that cheeres the world with golden beames;
Her suetest mouth, & lips that halff shee closes,
Did nothing yeild to corral & fresh roses;
Her brow more white, more beautiful, & gay
Then is a day but clouds in mids of May,
Under the which two equal planets glancing
Cast flames of loue; for loue theer stil is dancing.
While jurie, with a dantiest purple spred,
Of her faire cheeks resembld the fairest red.
Her neck semd framed by some most curious master,
Most white, most smoth, a piece of alabaster;
Upon her brest two aples round did grow,
With tops of strawberries more white then snow:
So far in grace sche did excell each other
That Cupid wald haue taine her for his mother. x. p. 64.

In the piece that follows we see Drummond of Hawthornden appearing in the rôle of a French poet, and addressing his friend and contemporary Alexander of Menstrie, subsequently Earl of Stirling, in a series of somewhat hobbling Alexandrines. These verses, undoubtedly written in Drummond's hand, do not, it is true, bear his signature, but the very faulty versification (the elision of the *i* of *qui* in ll. 2 and 5, and the use of the lyric feminine cæsura in ll. 9, 15 and 16), preclude the possibility that we may be in presence of a copy of verses by some unknown French poet. Defective as these lines are they afford a further testimony to the Laird of Hawthornden's familiarity with French.

Sur les œuures poetiques de Guillaume Alexandre, Sieur De Menstre.

Menstre, mignon de Pinde, astre des escossois,
le premier entre nous qu'osa toucher le bois
du docte Delien, faisant le monde entendre
les bourdons de ton luth, cõme vn autre Terpandre.
Esprit des bons esprits, qu'a charmè par ta vois
la dure Mort, et fait reuiure les grands rois,
a bon droict, maintenant, qu'on peut nommer Monarque,
Puisque par ton scauoir il ont vaincu les Parques,
ces rois qui te doyvent autant de lauriers
que leurs bras ont dontè des peuples guerriers.
tout ce n'estoit assez, au comble de ta gloire,
tu ensignas l'amour aux filles de Memoire :
le Pau devint honteux, Seine cacha son chef
a peine le monstrant au soleil derechef ;
les Charites dansent ; Amour ses traits redore
et aueugle s'estonne, voyant ta belle Aurore.
Dedans ta bouche naisse une manne de miel ;
Tousiours ton nom Douen alle bruant au ciel ;
Tousiours sois tu aimè d'Apollon et ton prince,
Fils aisnè de Pallas, l'honneur de ta prouince !

x. p. 163 (*v*).

More important, though only indirectly germane to the topic in hand, is a copy of a sonnet, in praise of Maitland of Ledington, by the French Hugenot poet Guillaume Salluste, Lord of Bartas, the author of the famous *Weeks*, whose extraordinary vogue, more particularly in Scotland, was further advanced there by royal patronage and emulation.

As the sonnet in question has not, as far as we are aware, been printed in any of the numerous editions of the poetical works of Du Bartas, we may be excused for reproducing it here :

A Monsieur de Ledinton, Chancelier et grand secretarye d'Escosse.

Ledinton, quand ie voye vne presse flottante
Qui s'entrecoudoyant t'importune et te suit,
O combien (di ie lors) vn grand esprit nous nuit,
O que cher est l'honneur qui sans fin nous tourmente !

Mais quand, sans te peiner, ta bouche d'or contente
Vn peuple qui bouillant ses affaires poursuit,
Que je te voye collè au travaill iour et nuit,
O, di ie, clair(e) esprit qui vit calme en tourmente,
Robuste tu sustiens tout l'estat escossois ;
Tu veilles pour ton roy, claire perle des roys ;
Franc d'Ennuis quelquefois ton ame au ciel s'enuole.
O plus fort qu'vn Hercule, o plus fort qu'un Atlas,
Tu portes (Ledinton) l'Escosse dans tes bras,
Ton prince dans ton cœur, dans ton cerueau le pole !

Par Guillaume Saluste, Sieur du Bartas. 1587.

Among the sonnets, still numerous in France at that time, penned during the reign of Henry IV, none caused so much stir in literary circles and at court, as that of the poet De Porchères on the eyes of Henry's beautiful mistress, Gabrielle d'Estrée, Marquise de Monceaux. It was much imitated and translated both in France and in other countries, and of the numerous translations that by Drummond is by no means the worst :

De Porcheres, on the eies of Madame la Marquise de Monceaux, vret this sonnet.

Ce ne sont pas des yeux, ce sont plustost de[s] dieux :
ils ont dessus les rois la puissance absoluë.
Dieux, non, ce sont des cieux : ils ont la couleur bluë,
et le mouuement prompt comme celuy des cieux.
Cieux, non, mais deux soleils clairement radieux,
dont les rayons brillans nous offusquent la veuë.
Soleils, non, mais esclairs de puissance incognuë,
des foudres de l'Amour signes presageux,
Car s'ils estoient des dieux, feraient ils tant de mal ?
Si des cieux, ils auroient leur mouuement esgal.
deux soleils ne se peut : le soleil est unique.
esclairs, non, car ceux-cy durent trop et trop clairs.
toutefois ie les nomme, afin que ie m'explique,
des yeux, des dieux, des cieux, des soleils, des esclairs.

Thus englished.

Wer these thine eies, or lightnings from aboue,
Whose glistring glances dazel'd so my sight ?
I tooke them to be lightnings sent from Joue
To threten that theer thunder bolt wald light.
but lightnings could not last so long so bright.
thay rather semed for to be suns, whose rayes
Promou'd to the Meridian of their might,
did change my noisome nights in joyful dayes.
but euen in that theer nomber them bewrayes
suns ar thay not : the world endures but one.
theer force theer figure & theer coulour sayes
that thay ar heuens, but heuens on earth ar none.
be what thay wil, theer poure in force agrees :
the heauens, the sunne, the lightnings, and her eies.

VIII. (*in fine*).

The piece that follows again shows Drummond practising translation from French.

To Anne, the French Queen, new come from Spaine, and applyable to Marye of England, meeting the King at Douer.

Enfin la voici, nous voyons ces beaux yeux,
L'amour de la terre et des cieux,
Dont notre Mars, en son choix bienheureux,
Est si fort amoureux.
Le ciel n'a iamais ioint à tant de beauté
Vn[e] si douce Maiesté,
Qui dans le cœur inspire, tour à tour,
Le respect et l'amour.
Enfin la voyci, nos vœux sont accomplis,
Nos esprits d'aise remplis.
Puisse en tous deux, par un heureux destin,
Viure un amour sans fin!

At length here shee is: wee haue got those bright eyes.
More shine now our earth than the skyes!
And our Mars, happye in his high desire,
Is all flame by this fire.

The spheeres in so heunlye face neuer fixed
High state with so meeke graces mixed,
Which in all hearts about it round inspires
True respect & chast fires.

At length both are met: our designes crowned are;
Each soule in the ioy hath a share.
May in both brestes this Isle of Vnion giue
Onlye one hart to liue! VIII.

The madrigals, and short pieces of that kind, are represented by the following, of which the first appears with variations among the poems first printed by David Laing in *Archaeologia Scotica* (vol. IV., p. 107).

Of Anthea.

When Hylas saw the eyne
Of Anthea his loue,
Who e're (said hee) such burning lampes hath seene,
Vnlesse in Heauen aboue?
Shee at his sillie praise
With blush more faire became.
In vaine (said hee) cheekes [in] skies that Morne doe raise,
For my hart cannot feele a greater flame.
X. p. 33.

In asshe her lies the wanton God of loue,
By her whom for I die.
For longtyme hauing hee
Bent all his powrs her marble hart to moue,
In spite of dart of gold
And torch of heunlye fire
That neere would know desire,
Nay what is strange mor harder grew & cold,
Hee doubting if the flame vnquencht remaned the same,
Wherwith hee heuen and earth did burne of old,
Proud on himselfe his brandones force,
Which, ere hee wist, consumd his little corse; X. p. 41.

On the lut of Margarite.

The harmonie wherto the heauens doe dance,
Keeping to curious notes a suoft cadance,
Nor al Joues quiristers ar not so suet
As is the voice & lut of Margarite.
If angry with his sheares he had vndoone thee,
Her onlie voice wald serue againe to tune thee;
If he phlegrean squadrons wald bring under,
Her lut wald combat better then his thunder.

x. 165 (*v*).

Idas to schunne sunnes beames
Did soune in cristal flood.
Perchance, like faire Aurore,
At Ganges bankes, Phillis came to the shore.
He lookt wher as sche stood,
And stracht did burne amidst these coldest streames.

x. p. 174.

O most perfidious face
That hauing lost thy loue
Dost yet retaine thy wonted hew and grace!
Thy smyling eyes did say
Thy splendour should be gone,
Thy cheekes faire roses fade
And furrowed be with wrinkles shown,
Ere thy affection any whit decay,
Which now is cold & dead.
Now, Tyme, { poste, / haste, } make her old:
In siluer turne her locks, her face like gold.

x. p. 241 (*v*).

This Monument vnder
Doth lie the wonder
Of that faire brest which Loue dar'd neuer tuch.
His courage kill'd him; but was it not much
A flea should bold and naked without armes
Of Loueres wronged thus reuenge the harmes?
Amantes proprio aere
Mi lite bene merenti posuere.

x. p. 54 (*v*).

The Hawthornden manuscripts contain a large number of epigrams, a good proportion of which are here omitted because of their excessive coarseness. It is never an easy matter to determine the paternity of these trifles, which were frequently passed on from one commonplace book to another. Although we have taken due precautions by careful enquiry in various quarters before ascribing to Drummond the paternity of those we quote, we still feel some hesitation as regards two or three of them, and invite readers of the *Modern Language Review* to correct any error into which we may have lapsed.

On a noble man who died at a counsel table.

Untymlie Death that neither wouldst conferre
Discourse nor parley with our great Treasurer,
Had thou beene as hee was, or one of his tribe,
Thou wouldst have spar'd his life & tane a Bribe.

Hee who so long, with gold and subtil wit,
Had iniur'd strong law, & almost conquerd it,
Hee who could lenthen causes and was able
To sterue a suiter at the counsel Table,
At lenth, not hauing euidents to show,
Was faine (Good lord) to take's Death. It was so.

VIII.

Epitaph.

Heere lyes a Docter, who with droges and pelfe
Could not corrupt Death, but dyed himselfe.

VIII.

Epitaph.

Heer lyes a cooke, who went to buye ylles,
But met death in the Market who turned up his heeles.

VIII.

That which preserueth cherries, peares and plumes
Can not preserue the liuer, lights and lungs.

VIII.

A lady in her prime to whom was giuen
As much perfection as could flow from Heauen,
Who, had shee liud when good was loud of men,
Had made the Graces fiue, the Muses ten.

VIII.

Strange is his end, his death most rare and od,
Who made his god his gold, his gold his god.

VIII.

Killd by ingratitude heere blest within doth rest:
To marye or not to marye which is best.

VIII.

Epigrammes.

Mops gaue his fath to Anne and Helen, yet doth ow:
Quho sayes good Mopsus hath no fath he lies, for he hath tuo.

x. p. 158.

Tom moneyless his agnus dei hath sold,
for he had rather want his God than gold.

x. p. 158.

Paul went to Toune to save himselfe from horning;
Scarse was he gone, when Kite him hornd that morning.

x. p. 165.

On the poems of——.

Thocht poets skil he vant, thinke it no crime,
for he knows nocht of poesie but rime.

x. p. 165.

Zoilus eies in glasse did see themselues looke euen:
That each of them micht gree, then both did pray to heauen.

x. p. 165.

A foolish change made wretchet Chremes dead:
his hairs gat gold, and thay left him but lead.

x. p. 165 (*v*).

Jeanne cal not your husband hart when ye him kis:
The harts do losse ther horns, but he keeps euer his.

x. p. 165 (*v*).

Why byeth old Chremes land so near his death?
Like loueth like: he halfe earth liketh earth.

x. p. 166.

Thocht louers lie, borne by the streame of yuth,
Yet when thay say ther dames no mortal creatures
Can be, but something els, sure thay say truth:
Women adord in feinds do change ther natures.
x. p. 166.

Into the sea Thomas al cornards wist,
But his faire wyff to suyme bad him learne first.
x. p. 166.

Chremes did hing himselff upon a tree,
Because the price of Ceres fruits did alter.
His seruant ran and cut the rope, but he,
Com'd to himselff, socht monnoye for the halter.
x. p. 166.

Be reasons good thou him a christian proueth:
H'il drinke strong wine, & flesh of suine wel loueth. x. p. 166.

Charles the IX of France.

Why vomits Charles so much blood from his brest?
The bloud he drank he culd not well digest. x. p. 173.

Out of Passerat.

Who cuckhold is & tries it not,
A honest man he is God wot.
Who well it sees yet wil not see,
A wise subtile man is hee.
Who searcheth if his head be hornd,
At best is worthie to be scornd. x. p. 173.

Samarias Motheres when to Death they steru'd
Did make a couenant their sonnes to eate.
The first (poor foole) aduanced hers for meate,
The other, pitifull, hid and preseru'd:
Comparisons are odious, therefore I
To Britannes kingdome will not this applye. x. p. 178.

Two bittes of Noses may make on tall nose.
Philip on Nose-bit had Leslea another.
Leslea a goodlye piece to make of those
Determinates to ioyne the two together.
But when Philps nose should but haue been his pray,
He tooke his head: lords was not that foule playe?
x. p. 184.

Epitaph.

Truth hatred breedes.
Who lyes beneath this stone
Thou shalt not know.
Yet know hee's not alone:
About him staye some findes for his euill deedes.
Let him who reedes
In haste this place foregoe. x. p. 186.

Discontented Phillis.

Blacke are my thoughts as is my husbands haire;
My fortune ill proportion'd like his face;
My mind wants joyes, his countenance all grace;
His wit is lead, myne heauye is with care.
In things so great since so $\left.\begin{matrix}\text{like}\\ \text{conforme}\end{matrix}\right\}$ wee be,
Who then can say but that wee will agree. x. p. 197.

Here lye the bones of a gentle horse
Who liuing used to carrye the corse
Of an insolent preacher. O had the asse
Of Balaam him carryed, he had told what he was!
Now courteous readers tell so, if yee can,
Is the Epitaph of the horse or of the Man.

x. p. 224.

Vindiciae against the Commones for B. C.

Some are that thinke it no way can agree
A Bishop good good Minister can bee,
Nay, that no more be in one man these can
Than to be honest and a Puritan.
How farre they runne astray and strangelie erre,
This Man showes, Man good, Bishop, Minister.
Onlie one fault hee had, for he did proue
Too meeke for this world, too too much a doue.
Hence harmelesse liu'd hee and exposed to wronges,
And now lyes murdered by iniurious tongues.
Such which talke still of Relligion,
Yet hold it best in practike to haue none,
Who deeme men like to him to be great euille,
May God to preach to them raise up some [deuill!]

x. p. 204.

L. E. Kastner.
E. Audra.

Manchester.

ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF 'S' IN GERMANIC.

The familiar rule of alliterative technique which requires that initial *s-* when followed by a voiceless explosive shall only alliterate with *s* + the same explosive and not with a single *s-* or with *s* + any other explosive, or with *s* + any consonant other than a voiceless explosive, would appear to throw some little light on the speech habits of the Germanic peoples and may at the same time perhaps find its explanation in those speech habits.

The necessity of alliterating *sp-* only with *sp-* and not with *sk-* or *sn-* or *s-* or any other combination than *sp-* can only be accounted for on the assumption that the latter alliteration failed, in some way not self-evident, to satisfy the essential requirements of alliteration. The essential requirement of alliteration, as of rime and assonance, may be said to be the recurrence of sounds which in their acoustic effects are identical. The question of vowel alliteration may be left out of the question for the present, and we are therefore forced to the conclusion that in the inadmissible alliteration of *sp-* with *sn-* there is such a difference in the acoustic effect of the *s* as to destroy the impression of identity.

It should be noticed that initial *s-* can alliterate freely either with itself or with *s* + any consonant except a voiceless explosive, so that one may assume that in such positions the acoustic value of *s-* was always the same. On the other hand *s-* cannot alliterate with *sp-*, *sk-*, *st*, and therefore we may assume that these three combinations formed a closed group with some special distinguishing features of their own, one of which must be a different acoustic value of the initial *s-*. It may however be urged that if we deduce different values of *s-* from the inadmissibility of the alliteration *sp-* : *sn-* we may also deduce different values of *s-* from the inadmissibility of the alliteration *sp-* : *sk-*. This however is not a valid objection; for, as we have seen, *sp-*, *sk-*, *st-*, form a group by themselves, and hence the cause of the special treatment of

this *group* may also be the cause of the special treatment of members *within* the group, and this we shall see to be the case.

Moreover *s-* may alliterate with *sn-* or *sl-* or *s* followed by any consonant except a voiceless explosive, and the consonant plays no determining role in the alliteration; but in the combinations *st-*, *sp-*, *sk-*, the consonant *does* play a determining role, in so far as it participates and must participate in the alliteration. Consequently, if *st-* cannot alliterate with *sp-* it is because of the difference of consonant and not because of any difference in the value of the *s-*.

We are thus forced to the conclusion that whereas the acoustic value of *s-* in the groups *st-*, *sp-*, *sk*, is the same, or, at any rate, not necessarily different, this acoustic value differs from the value of *s-* in all other combinations. It remains to enquire wherein this difference consists.

It can scarcely be said to be a difference of articulation or quality, for the *s-* was in all probability articulated in the same way in *sm-*, *sn-*, etc., as in *st-*, *sp-*, *sk*, since there is nothing, phonetically speaking, to shift the articulation—the articulation of *sm-* corresponds exactly (if we except the nasal factor of the *m*) to that of *sp-* and *sn-* to *st-*. Rather we should expect to find the difference in the stress or quantity of the *s-*. A little experiment will immediately show that *s-* followed by a continuant is of much greater length and much more clear and distinct acoustically than an *s-* followed by a voiceless stop. The manner of articulation of the groups *st-* and *sn-* confirms this experience, for in the pronunciation of *st-* the current of air is cut off at a very early stage in order to form the position for the *-t-*. In the group *sn-*, on the other hand, the current of air is not cut off at all in the transition from the *s-* to the *-n-*, and hence the acoustic effect of the *s-* is much stronger when the latter sound is followed by a continuant.

In the case of *st-*, *sp-*, *sk-* the first sound is, as it were, subordinated to, and almost swallowed up by, the explosion which follows it. In the case of strongly stressed or aspirated explosives the effect of the initial *s-* would be still less. Thus it is that if in a large room somebody at a distance cries out 'Speech!' the *s-*, though by nature a more sonorous sound than a *p*, and one which carries further, is yet lost in this case and the *-p-* is heard more clearly than the *s-*. In this partial suppression of initial *s-* by a succeeding explosive is doubtless to be found the explanation of the rule which requires the alliteration of *sp-* with *sp-*, etc., more especially since the old Germanic poetry was composed for the ear, intended for large audiences, and frequently recited in the open air. It

was felt, no doubt, that since the explosive was the predominating initial sound and not the spirant, the explosive should participate in the alliteration.

The whole question may also be approached from another side. Jespersen has already pointed out (*Lehrbuch der Phonetik*, § 192 ff.) that a syllable consists of a rise in sonority up to the head of the syllable and of a fall in sonority from the head of the syllable to its end. The initial groups *st-*, *sp-*, *sk-* would seem however to be at variance with this principle, in so far as *s* is a more sonorous sound than *p*. This difference in sonority is however very slight in the case of *s* and *t*, *p*, or *k*, and is further reduced by weakening the expiratory force of the *s-*, as we have seen above. If the difference of sonority had been more marked, as for example between *m* + *p*, the combination would have been impossible at the beginning of a syllable. The initial groups *sp-*, *st-*, *sk-* are, in any case, very unstable at the beginning of a syllable and would appear to survive only on one of three conditions:

(i) Either the initial *s-* becomes the final *-s* of a prefixed syllable, *e.g.* Latin *strictum* > Fr. *estroit*, Lat. *studium* > Fr. *estude*, Lat. *spiritum* > Fr. *esprit*.

(ii) Or the explosive is pronounced with greater articulatory stress (cf. Guinecken, *Principes de linguistique psychologique*, Paris, 1907, § 531).

(iii) Or the quantity (and hence the sonority) of the *s-* is reduced.

That *s* in the groups *st-*, etc. is subject to special modifications due to speech habit may also be seen from the comparison of initial *st-* with final *-st*. In the latter, in such a word as 'fast,' the passage from *s* to *t* represents a perfectly normal descent in sonority and therefore *s* is not weakened in any way and is a clear and distinct sound. Far from being in any way affected by the final *t*, it frequently gains in length at the expense of the *t*, as in 'a fast train' = 'ə fās trein' or 'a fast boat' = 'ə fās bout.' It is true that in these cases the loss of the final *t* may be due to the difficulty of pronouncing *t* + *t* or *b*, but the important fact remains that in this position the *s* retains its character, whereas in the initial position it modifies its character. So also in such a word as 'fāsn̥' (fasten) if we divide the syllables 'fas-sten' we can readily see why the *t* disappears with compensation lengthening of the *s*, instead of weakening the *s* and keeping the *t*. If, indeed, in modern English we preserve the *t*, then the syllabication immediately becomes 'fās-ten' (just as in 'of-ten' as distinguished from 'oft').

If, then, initial *s* in the groups *st-*, etc., is a weakened *s*, coalescing, as it were, with the following explosive, it becomes clear that *sp-* can only alliterate with *sp-*, and *sk-* with *sk-*, etc., because these groups alone satisfied the requirement of identical recurring sounds, and it would also appear that this identity was interpreted more strictly than is commonly supposed. The conclusion that complete identity of sound alone sufficed is further borne out by the investigations of R. M. Meyer (*Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, XXVI, 149), who discovers a strong tendency in old Germanic poetry to alliterate two initial consonants instead of one.

Incidentally it might be observed that this may throw some light on the current theories of vowel-alliteration. One of these theories assumes the glottal catch to have been the alliterating element in vowel alliteration, and has often been called in question on other grounds. If, however, *sp-* could not alliterate with *st-* because the *s* sound was too weak, how shall we believe that the glottal catch—a still less sonorous sound—should have constituted the alliteration before initial vowels?

E. CLASSEN.

MANCHESTER.

ON SOME ETYMOLOGIES OF ENGLISH WORDS.

THESE notes deal with the non-Germanic, for the most part with the Romanic, element in Prof. Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, ed. 4, 1910 (S.D.). I have taken this dictionary as my starting-point, because in this marvellous compendium of etymological research it must be allowed that, generally speaking, we may find the latest word that scholars have to say on the derivation of English words.

I. *Some Etymologies suggested in the place of those advanced in S.D.*

AISLE. S.D. gives the usual derivation from Fr. *aile* a wing. I would suggest that in the modern word two distinct words have been confused together. The consideration of the forms given in N.E.D. points to two distinct sources, namely, Lat. *ala* (Fr. *aile*) and Lat. *insula* (Fr. *île*). In our 'aisle' the pronunciation points to an original connexion with the word *isle*, whereas the spelling is a contaminated spelling of Fr. *isle* (whence the *s*) and Fr. *aile* (whence the *ai*-). The history of this architectural term seems to show that '*isle*' was the predominant partner. The spelling *ile* (*isle*) was the ordinary spelling of the word from the beginning of the fifteenth century to the middle of the eighteenth century. Pope writes *isle* in *Eloisa to Abelard* and *ile* in *The Temple of Fame*. *Aisle* is quite a modernism, only hesitatingly admitted by Johnson in 1755, and has no direct connexion with the early English forms *ele*, *eil* derived from Fr. *ele* and Lat. *ala*, cited in N.E.D.

AITCH-BONE. S.D. gives the dialect word *ice-bone* as one of the forms of *aitch-bone*. The words are synonymous, but are quite distinct in origin. It is a matter of common knowledge that an older form of *aitch-bone* was *nache-bone*, a form still existing in Yorkshire (West Riding), see Carr's *Craven Glossary* (E.D.D.); cp. O.F. *nache* a buttock. But the word *ice-bone* is of Low German origin; cp. *is-been* 'das Hüftbein' (Bremen); Dutch *is-been* the haunch (Hexham); Mid. Low G. *îsbên* 'Eisbein' (Schiller-Lübben); Old Low G. *îsbên* 'clunis' (N.E.D. s.v. *Ice-bone*). The origin of *îs* is unknown.

AVERAGE. This is a word of English formation, for which no quotations are given in N.E.D. earlier than the sixteenth century. It is generally agreed that *average* is composed of the widely spread Mediterranean word *avaria* + suffix *-age*. The form of the word with the suffix *-age* is due to the analogy of other marine and mercantile terms such as 'poundage,' 'tonnage,' 'pilotage.' The word *avaria* is found in the maritime codes, ordinances and records of Mediterranean commerce as early as the thirteenth century. What was the original meaning of this Mediterranean word? S.D. says, 'Origin unknown,' and agrees with N.E.D. in denying any connexion of *avaria* with the Arabic word *'awar* meaning 'loss, damage.' N.E.D. says that 'the word *'awar* is merely a modern Arabic translation and adaptation of the western maritime term in its latest sense.' I think it can be shown that the original meaning of the Mediterranean word *avaria* was damage or loss, identical therefore with the meaning of the Arabic *'awar*.

This is certainly the usual meaning of *avaria* in the Romanic languages. Compare Ital. *avaria* 'a sea-phrase, viz. a consumption or distribution of the *loss* made, when goods are cast away on purpose in a storm to save the vessel' (Florio); Port. *avaria* 'damage to a vessel or cargo'; Fr. *avarie* 'dommage arrivé à un vaisseau ou aux marchandises dont il est chargé depuis le départ jusqu'au retour' (*Dict. de l'Académie*, 1786).

Dozy has no doubt whatever about the derivation of *avaria*: 'il est très certainement d'origine arabe.' He derives the word from Arab. *'awar* loss, damage, and says (p. 217):

> Il ne faut pas croire que *'awâr*, pris en ce sens, est un néologisme ; il appartient au contraire à la langue arabe classique, dans laquelle on dit 'une marchandise qui a un défaut (*'awâr*).' Les marchands italiens, par suite des relations fréquentes qu'ils avaient avec les Arabes, ont adopté le mot *'awâr*, qui était fort en usage, dans le commerce ; ce qui le prouve, c'est que les passages que Ducange donne sous *'Avaria'* sont empruntés à des documents génois et pisans...—La transcription *avaria* est bonne ; *ia* est la terminaison italienne. On trouve cette forme dans un document catalan de 1258 (apud Capmany).

All the uses of *avaria* and its derivative forms may be deduced from the primary meaning of damage or loss. It is interesting to note that in mod. Provençal *auvâri* is still in use for 'harm, damage' (see Mistral's transl. of Genesis, 42. 4).

Finally, it may be noted that the radical meaning of *loss* is common Semitic, and may be traced in the Hebrew root *'âwar*, which is found in the special sense of *loss* of eyesight, blindness.

BOTHER. S.D. remarks that this word first occurs in English literature in the writings of Irishmen. This fact would suggest that we

must look to Ireland for an etymology. The 'bother' which occurs in Swift and Sheridan may be simply the Irish word *bodhradh* as written and pronounced by Englishmen. This word with its many relations is one of the commonest in the Irish language. In Dinneen's *Dict.* (1904) *bodhradh* is rendered 'deafness, stunning, confusion.' A common expression among the Irish is *bodhar leat*, that is, 'confusion attend you, *bother* you.' Also, *ná bí am' bhodhradh* 'don't bother me.' *Bodhradh* is a derivative of *bodhar* 'deaf,' also, 'bothered, confused, annoyed.' *Bodhar* has cognates with the primary meaning of 'deaf' in the other Celtic languages. Wel. *byddar*, O. Corn. *bodhar*, Bret. *bouzar*. Compare Skr. *badhira* deaf. Joyce, in his *English in Ireland* (1910), p. 221, says, 'In its primary sense of to deafen *bodhram* is used in the oldest Irish documents: thus in the Book of Leinster we have: *Ro bodrais* sind, 'you have made us deaf (i.e., have *bothered* us) [talking about your son].' In E.D.D. the verb 'to bother' is rendered 'to deafen, to stun, to perplex with noisy chatter; to confuse.'

It must be owned that there is one difficulty in connecting our word 'bother' with the Irish *bodhar*—namely, in the retention of the inter-vocal dental in the English pronunciation of the word. It may be urged that there is no analogy for the Irish aspirated consonant being so treated in Irish words introduced into an Anglo-Irish dialect. But the history of the word 'bother' and its sense-development seem to me to make out a good case for the proposed etymology.

Caprice. 'A sudden change or turn of mind without apparent or adequate motive; a desire or opinion arbitrarily or fantastically formed; a freak, whim, mere fancy' (N.E.D.). The word was adopted from the French after the Restoration, 1660. It is a French form of the Ital. *capriccio* used precisely in the same sense as the English word. The word has been generally connected by etymologists with some Italian word for goat—*capro* a buck-goat or *caprio* a kid, as if it originally meant the skip or frisk of a goat or kid. In S.D. we are told 'this is not quite sure.' Neither Diez nor Skeat makes any attempt at explaining the formation of the word. *Capriccio* is a genuine Italian word, formed on Italian soil. How is the suffix *-iccio* to be accounted for? *Iccio* is only an adjectival suffix qualifying adjectives, as for example, *verdiccio* greenish from *verde* green. Has anyone ever heard of it as a substantival suffix appearing in words derived from substantives? N.E.D. suggests a Latin type *capriceus* (sic): I suppose *capricius* is intended. But Lat. *-icius* is an adjectival suffix, cp. *facticius*, Ital. *fatticcio* artificial. There is no evidence for an Italian adj. *capriccio*.

The derivation of this Italian word has been missed because etymologists in endeavouring to explain the word have considered only its modern meaning. It is quite certain that the primary meaning of *capriccio* was not a sudden freak or whim: the word was originally used in the sense of a sudden fear, a horror making the hair to stand on end 'like quills upon the fretful porcupine'—'quel tremore che fa *arricciare* i capelli o per freddo o per orrore di checchessia' (Fanfani); '*Capriccio* a sudden fear apprehended making one's hair to stand on end' (Florio). With *capriccio* in this sense we may compare Florio's definition of *arricciare* 'for a man's hair to bristle and stand on end through sudden fear.' Florio expressly connects this verb *arricciare* with *capriccio*; he has the entry '*Arricciacapo* as *Capriccio*,' evidently taking *capriccio* to be equivalent with *capo* + *riccio*. How can *riccio* be explained? It is a verbal subst. from *ricciare* to bristle (Florio). Thus *capriccio* means literally 'the bristling of the head.' The verb *arricciare* is a derivative of the Ital. *riccio* hedgehog, Lat. *ericius*. In all the Romanic languages the name for this curious effect of sudden emotion is connected with the word for the hedgehog. From the Lat. *ericius* hedgehog was formed the Romanic derivative *ericionem*, whence O.F. *eriçon* (mod. *hérisson*, cp. E. *urchin*). With *hérisson* cp. *hérisser* 'dresser les cheveux.' So Prov. *erisso* (*erissar*); Span. *erizo* (*erizar*), Port. *ouriço* (*ouriçar*). From *urchin* the ordinary dialect word for the hedgehog in the north of England we have in north Yorkshire the verb 'to *urchin*'; a man will say, 'It made me *urchin*,' meaning, 'It made my hair stand on end, it made my flesh creep.' Who would have thought that 'urchin,' our uncomplimentary word for a little boy, can be etymologically connected with the word 'caprice,' the two words being bound to one another by a common origin from the Latin word for a hedgehog?

The semantology of the Ital. *capriccio* may be illustrated from that of the Lat. *horror*. This word is connected with *horrere* to dread, lit. to bristle, with reference to the bristling of the hair through terror. Compare Skt. root *hṛṣ* (of the hair) to bristle by reason of fright or pleasure, hence, to be excited with pleasure or fear; cognate with Gr. χήρ hedgehog, identical with Old Lat. *hēr*, of which Lat. *ericius* is a derivative form. So then the Ital. *capriccio* is etymologically connected with Lat. *horror*—*riccio* and *horror* being derived ultimately from an Indo-Germanic root *GHERS* to bristle, to be rough.

Cozen. 'To trick, to cheat, to defraud' (so Johnson). S.D. considers this word to be a variant of the verb 'to *cousin*,' 'to call cousin,' 'to claim kindred with,' and compares it with Fr. *cousiner* 'appeler quelqu'un

cousin; il se dit aussi dans le style familier des petits Gentilshommes de campagne qui vont visiter les autres plus riches, pour vivre quelque temps chez eux' (*Dict. de l'Académie*, 1786). But is there any necessary connexion between sponging and cheating? I think that Prof. Weekley has made out a good case for equating our word *cozen* with the Ital. *cozzonare* 'to play the Horse-courser; by met.: to play the crafty knave, to have perfect skill in all *Cozenages*' (Florio). For ample evidence in support of this equation the reader is referred to Professor Weekley's Paper on Anglo-French Etymologies in *Transactions of the Philological Society* (1909), p. 12.

Esplanade. S.D. tells us that the Fr. *esplanade* is 'formed in imitation of Ital. *spianata* an esplanade.' Imitation of an Italian word is an unnecessary hypothesis. *Esplanade* is a genuine native formation, of Provençal origin, cp. Prov. *esplanada*, deriv. of *esplanar* to level, to make plain; also, to explain. Compare Sp. *esplanada* 'properly the Glacis of the Counter-scarp in Fortification; the empty space between the Glacis of a Citadel and the first Houses of a Town' (Stevens).

Full. 'To full cloth.' S.D. derives this word (M.E. *fullen*) directly from O.F. *fuler* (mod. F. *fouler*), the *u* representing Romanic close *o*. But then we should expect *fowl* not *full* in modern English. Certainly O.F. *fuler* (Rom. *folare*) could not have been represented by *fullen* in Middle English. It may be safely assumed that our verb 'full' represents an O.E. *fullian*, which may be inferred from O.E. *fullere* (in Mark 9. 3). It is probable that O.E. *fullere* a fuller, and O.F. *fuler* (to full), are independent derivatives of a Late Latin *fullare* to full cloth, cognate with Lat. *fullo* a fuller.

Gavelkind. S.D. connects O.E. *gafol* with *gifan* (to give) and makes it the origin of the Low Latin *gabulum*. I think there can be no doubt that the Latin *gabulum* and the O.E. *gafol* are identical, but it is impossible to accept the view that *gafol* is a genuine Teutonic word, or that *gabulum* can be derived from an English source. It seems to me that there are good reasons for holding that Lat. *gabulum* is of Arabic origin, and that O.E. *gafol* directly represents the Latin form *gabulum*. The two words are identical in meaning: they both mean 'tax, tribute'; certainly *gafol* never meant a gift, as the etymology of S.D. would seem to imply. Again, *gafol* is precisely the form we should expect *gabulum* to assume in Old English, if borrowed at an early date. If one studies the article *Gablum* (*gabulum*) in Ducange, it will be seen how widely

spread the word was in the sense of 'census, tributum, reditus' throughout Europe and especially on the shores of the Mediterranean, and how impossible it is to suppose that a word of such universal currency can have its origin in an isolated Teutonic form, only to be found in our little island. Such an hypothesis has only to be examined in the light of Ducange's account of *gabulum* to be summarily rejected.

What is the origin of *gabulum*? I see no reason for not accepting Dozy's view that it is a Latinization of the Arabic word *qabâla* which means a tax or tribute, esp. a tax on land. Dozy puts the matter very clearly. He says:

> Le mot anglo-saxon présente, quant à la forme, de grandes difficultés, et il serait assez étrange que les peuples du midi eussent emprunté le nom d'un impôt aux Anglais, avec lesquels ils avaient bien peu de rapports, tandis qu'ils en avaient beaucoup avec les Arabes. Les habitants de l'Italie méridionale vivaient même sous la domination de ces derniers, et c'était à eux qu'ils payaient les tributs. *Glossaire*, pp. 74, 75.

It should be noted that in Italy the Arabic word was also written *caballa* and *cabella*. The initial *g* in *gabulum* need create no difficulty, as the Arab. *qof* is sometimes represented by *g* in the Romanic languages[1].

Arab. *qabâla* is from the √ *qabal* to receive, take from, hence the verb *qabil*, cp. Heb. *qābal* with the same meaning, from which is derived the Rabbinical word for oral tradition which is written in English *cabbala*.

Hugger-mugger. 'Secrecy'; *in hugger-mugger* 'clandestinely.' S.D. considers the first element of this reduplicated word to be unmeaning, and connects the second element with the word *muck*. This is not very satisfactory. It is suggested by Dr Joyce in *English as we speak it in Ireland* (1909), p. 243, that the Anglo-Irish word *cugger-mugger* may be an older form of *hugger-mugger*, both the words connoting secrecy. *Cugger-mugger* means whispering, gossiping in a low voice. Compare the Irish word *cogar* which means primarily a whisper. *Cogar* has many derivatives with the sense of whispering, secret confabulation, clandestine plotting, conspiring; see Dinneen's Irish Dictionary...The Middle-Irish form of the word is *coccur* (Leabhar Breac). The form *hugger-* (with initial *h*, may be explained as due to an aspirated *c*. This explanation of an initial *h* may also account for another *hugger* (also *hogger*), the name in some parts of Scotland for a coarse stocking (see E.D.D.). This word (as E.D.D. and N.E.D. suggest) may be

[1] See Engelmann's note on the representation of initial *qof* in Dozy's *Glossaire* (ed. 2), p. 15. It is there said, 'au Maroc le ق (qof) se prononce constamment *g*, Dombay, p. 5.'

connected with the synonymous M.E. *cocker* a casing for the leg, a word still in use in the north for coarse stockings without feet. This *cocker* is identical with O.E. *cocer* a quiver. The etymology of this *cocer* is unknown. It is probably not of Teutonic origin. It may be noted that *κούκουρον* (*κούρκουρον* in Theophanes) occurs in Greek authors as early as the ninth century.

Imbrue. S.D. gives 'to moisten' as the meaning of *imbrue*, and of the French equivalent *embruer*, and holds that *embruer* is a variant of O.F. *embreuver* to moisten, and that the -breuver of *embreuver* represents a causal verb **biberare* from Lat. *bibere* to drink. Grave objections can be brought against this explanation of the word *imbrue* (Fr. *embruer*) from considerations of form and meaning. If we examine the quotations given under 'imbrue' in N.E.D. or in Johnson's Dictionary we cannot help seeing that the primary, the central meaning of *imbrue* is not to moisten, drench, but to stain, soil, defile. The word is used especially of hands defiled by blood. N.E.D. gives a separate section to the meaning 'to stain, dye one's hand, sword, etc. *in* or *with* blood, slaughter, etc.,' illustrated by many quotations. As to form, I think that the *u* both in *imbrue* and in Fr. *embruer* must point to a Latin *ū*. In mod. Provençal there is a verb *embruti*, which renders 'maculare' of the Vulgate, Gen. 49. 4 (Mistral's version). May not this word be equated with *imbrue*? Compare Ital. '*bruttare* to foul, to pollute, to defile, to sully' (Florio). In northern dialects Latin *tt* whence Romanic simplified intervocal *t* is sometimes lost, as in the case of *Matt(h)aeum*, Fr. *Mathieu*, Ang.-Nor. *Maheu* (in *Chanson de Roland*), cp. the English surname *Mayhew*.

Marchpane. This is a word of obscure origin. Many explanations have been suggested by etymologists, but no explanation has been offered, as far as I am aware, that has been made out clearly enough to command the general approval of scholars. S.D. takes the Ital. *marcia-pane* as the original form, and says, 'The origin of *marcia* is unknown; it probably represents a name such as Lat. *Martia*; *pane* is Lat. *panem* bread.' Now, the name for this popular kind of confectionery is known in various forms all over Europe. The forms may be divided into two groups—(*α*) the *r*- group and (*β*) the non-*r*- group: (*α*) Ital. *marzapane*, also *marciapane* (Florio); Fr. *marcepain* (in sixteenth century, see N.E.D.); Ger. *martzepan* (1521); Du. *marcepain* (1486); Da. *marsipan*; E. *marchpane*; (*β*) Sp. *mazapan*; Port. *maçapão*; Fr. *massepain*; Prov. *massapan*. An ingenious attempt to explain this difficult word has been made by Kluyver in *Zeitschr. f. deutsche Wortforschung*, July 1904.

I will give the main points of Kluyver's argument. What seems to be the same word as the word we are discussing occurs in various Romanic forms in the sense of a small box: *Massapanum* (Fr. *massepan*), 'Arcula,' a Massilian word, also *Maczapanum* (Dauphiné); see Ducange; Neap. *marzapane* a little box of wood or paste-board; Prov. *massapan* (O. Prov. *masapan*) 'boîte ou petite caisse faite de bois léger dans laquelle on met ordinairement ou des confitures ou des choses précieuses' (Honnorat). Kluyver says that the preparation of sugar and almonds (which we call 'marchpane') was of Oriental origin, and was sold in the Levant in such boxes, hence the Italian name for the sweetmeat (*marzapane*). Pegolotti says that in Famagosta, Cyprus, the sweetmeat *marzapane* was sold in little wooden boxes called *marzapani*[1].

But what is the etymology of this name for a little box, *marzapane* (*massapanum*)? Kluyver connects the word with the name of a Levantine coin current in the twelfth century, which is found in the Ital. form *marzapane* as a trade word in Syria[2]. This is the same word as *matapanus* the name of a Venetian coin, on which word Ducange gives the following account taken from a Chronicle (ann. 1193): 'Subsequenter Dux [Andreas Dandulus] argenteam monetam, vulgariter dictam, *Grossi Venetiani* vel *Matapani*, cum imagine Jesu Christi in throno...primo fieri decrevit.'

Kluyver identifies this word with the Arab. *mauthabân* (or *mausabân*) which means one who sits, one who stays always at home, used of a king who undertakes nothing; and conjectures that it may have been used by the Saracens as a descriptive name for the coin bearing this image.

A. L. Mayhew.

Oxford.

[1] For the development of meaning compare the history of the word *junket* meaning (1) a rush-basket, (2) a cream-cheese offered for sale in a rush-basket (N.E.D.).

[2] Compare the history of the word *gazette*, It. *gazzetta* 'a kind of small coin in Venice' (Florio), also the name of a newspaper published in Venice, either because the paper cost a *gazzetta* or because this was the sum paid for the privilege of reading it (N.E.D.).

(To be concluded.)

THE CENTENARY OF THE COMPLETION OF CARY'S 'DANTE.'

On May 8, 1812, Cary made the following entry in his *Journal*:—'Finished my translation of Dante's *Commedia*—begun the 16th of Jan. 1797.' The translation of the *Inferno* had been published in two volumes in 1805–6, accompanied by the Italian text, then for the first time printed in England. This first instalment, greatly to Cary's mortification, was received with 'coldness and indifference.' But in spite of the discouragement he persevered with his task, and six years later he was able to record its completion as above.

The complete translation was not published for another two years, the delay being due in part to Cary's failure to find a publisher. Finally he decided to publish at his own expense, and in January 1814 the work appeared in three diminutive volumes (small enough to fit conveniently into 'the aptest corner' of Keats' knapsack on a walking tour), at what was then regarded as the modest price of twelve shillings, in boards. Little notice was taken of the book by reviewers or public until four years after its publication, when it suddenly leaped into fame in consequence of an appreciative mention by Coleridge in a lecture on Dante delivered in London in February 1818. Coleridge's praise was promptly echoed in an article in the *Edinburgh Review*, with the result that nearly a thousand unsold copies of the first edition were at once disposed of, and a demand was made for a new edition. Within a few months Cary received from the booksellers more than £200 as profits from a venture which he had written off as a dead failure; while at the same time his reputation in the world of letters was established beyond question as the translator of Dante.

No record, unfortunately, has been preserved of the remarks by Coleridge in his lecture which so profoundly affected the fortunes of Cary's translation. Rogers, who was present at the lecture, merely recalls that Coleridge 'spoke of Cary's *Dante* in high terms of praise';

while Crabb Robinson, who entered notes of the lecture in his *Diary*, makes no reference to the mention of Cary. Coleridge's estimate of the work, however, may be gathered from other sources. In the *Friend* he consoles himself for the fact that his own translation of *Wallenstein* 'has long ago been used up, as "winding-sheets for pilchards,"' with the reflection that 'a much better and very far more valuable work, the Rev. Mr Cary's incomparable translation of Dante had very nearly met with the same fate'; and in a correspondence with Cary himself, whom he styles 'Dante's English Duplicate and Re-incarnation,' he says:

'In the peculiar character of the Blank Verse, your translation of Dante has transcended what I should have thought possible without the Terza Rima. In itself, the metre is, compared with any English poem of one quarter the length, the most varied and harmonious to my ear of any since Milton, and yet the effect is so Dantesque that to those who should compare it only with other English poems, it would, I doubt not, have the same effect as the Terza Rima has compared with other Italian metres.... Of the diction, I can only say that it is Dantesque even in that in which the Florentine must be preferred to our English giant—namely that it is not only pure *language*, but pure *English*.'

Still more eloquent testimony to Coleridge's high appreciation of Cary's performance is afforded by the marginal annotations in pen and pencil in his own copy of the second edition (1819) of the translation, which is preserved in the British Museum.

'Those only who see the difficulty of the original,' he writes on one passage, 'can do justice to Mr Cary's Translation—which may now and then not be Dante's *Words*, but always, always, *Dante*.'

'Admirably translated!' he notes in another place. 'O how few will appreciate its value! Genius is not alone sufficient—it must be present, indeed, in the Translator, in order to supply a *negative* Test by its sympathy; to *feel* that it *has* been well done. But it is *Taste, Scholarship, Discipline*, TACT, that must do it.'

In the preface to his second edition (published in July 1819, in three handsome 8vo volumes at 36/-) Cary gratefully acknowledges his indebtedness to Coleridge, but for whose 'prompt and strenuous exertions in recommending the book to public notice' the new edition would never have come into existence. The popularity of the work was well maintained during Cary's lifetime. A third edition (in 3 vols. 12mo, at 18/-) was published in 1831; and a fourth (in a single volume 12mo, at 10/6; and, to compete with a pirated American edition, 8vo in double columns, at 6/-, which was sold out within a fortnight) in 1844,

the year of his death; since which date innumerable cheap reprints have been issued both here and in America.

There have been only two serious rivals to Cary's translation, namely those of Wright and Longfellow. Wright's translation, in bastard *terza rima*, was first published in three instalments, in 1833–36–40. It went through several editions, and had the advantage of being the translation quoted in preference to Cary by the late Dean Church in his famous essay on Dante (1850); and it is still occasionally reprinted. But in spite of its attractive metre and scholarly qualities it has not succeeded in dethroning Cary. Longfellow's version, in literal line for line blank verse, the first complete American translation, was first published (in Boston and London) in 1867. It at once achieved a wide popularity both in this country and in America, and has many times been reprinted. With Americans it may perhaps by now have displaced Cary, but to an Englishman Cary still, after a hundred years, remains the translation which, as Dr Garnett expressed it, occurs first to the mind on the mention of Dante.

To the present generation, which has something like thirty versions of the *Commedia* to choose from, in every variety of metre, the enthusiasm of Coleridge and his contemporaries for Cary's translation may seem difficult to account for. But if any one who shares this opinion will place himself at Coleridge's standpoint, and acquaint himself with the methods of Dante translation in vogue before Cary, he will cease to be surprised. Let him compare Cary with some of his immediate predecessors, with Charles Rogers, for instance, of whose *Inferno* (1782) the following are fair samples:

> Above the bank, which served to conceal
> Like breeches, all the parts below the waist.
>
> I saw
> Two frozen in one hole; the head of one,
> Like to a hat, the other's covered o'er:
> And, greedily as bread in hunger's eat,
> In th' under's skull the upper fix'd his teeth.

Or with Boyd (1785), who speaks of Dante's Virgil as 'him who sung Eliza's woes'; and by way of 'dilating the scanty expressions' of his author, adds 'characteristic imagery' of his own, so as to expand, for example, half a line of Dante, consisting of two names, into a stanza of six lines. Or with Jennings (1794), who recast the Ugolino episode into 'one consistent *Ensemble*,' and omitted from his translation of the 'little Novel of Francesca' thirty-five lines as being 'injurious to the Poem,' besides suppressing all reference to the tail of Minos in the fifth

canto, 'being rather shocked to think that so elegant a Poet should have so wantonly given him One, and of such enormous Length as to go many Times round him.' Or with Wharton (1802), who, while proclaiming his fidelity to the original, does not scruple to father upon Dante this tasteless tag at the end of the Ugolino:—

> The Spectre ceas'd: and kindling with disdain
> Snatch'd the torn scalp with eager fangs again.
> Still as he gnaws, the flesh, the vessels grow:
> Still as he quaffs the purple currents flow:
> Still o'er th' eternal wound the fibres spread:
> Such is their mutual doom: and such th' atonement paid.

To turn from such travesties as these to Cary's 'polar-star' version, as Lamb called it, is to emerge as it were from the dark ages of Dante translation. Himself a poet and a scholar, Cary was the first who approached Dante with the reverence due to a great poet and a great classic, and who entered on his task with the resolve to follow faithfully 'dietro alle poste delle care piante' of his master. As his *Journal* testifies, Cary did not grudge to bestow upon the *Commedia* the labour and love, 'il lungo studio e il grande amore,' which other scholars had been accustomed to reserve for the masterpieces of ancient literature; and he thus, after years of patient toil, qualified himself to produce the translation which once and for all made Dante a possession of the English-speaking world, and won for the translator himself a grave among the illustrious dead in Westminster Abbey.

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.

THE SOURCES OF HEBBEL'S 'AGNES BERNAUER.'

III[1].

Hebbel's Indebtedness to Törring's 'Agnes Bernauerinn.'

It is a significant fact that no fewer than five of Hebbel's dramas owe their origin to his dissatisfaction with an already existing work on the same subject. Although Hebbel had known the Volksbuch of *Genoveva* from his boyhood[2], he only definitely commenced work on his drama when disappointed at not finding the story adequately treated by Maler Müller and Tieck. The representation of Massinger's *Ludovico*[3] (a version of the Herod-Marianne story of Josephus) and Raupach's *Nibelungen Hort*[4] at the Hofburgtheater incited Hebbel to write his *Herodes und Marianne* and *Nibelungen* trilogy. Schiller's *Demetrius* called forth Hebbel's last drama, and similarly *Agnes Bernauer* owes its existence to Graf Törring's *Agnes Bernauerinn, ein vaterländisches Trauerspiel.* Hebbel has himself stated how important a *rôle* Törring's drama played in the genesis of his own. 'Ich kannte dies Werk, ich achtete es auch als eine sehr gelungene Ausbeutung der historischen Anecdote, konnte mich aber mit der Auffassung so wenig befreunden, dass gerade sie mich vorzugsweise mit zu meiner Arbeit antrieb[5]'; in other words it was Törring's treatment of the problem, which drew Hebbel's attention to its suitability for giving voice to several of his favourite ideas.

Before considering Hebbel's actual indebtedness to his predecessor, it may be advisable to recapitulate briefly the most important points

[1] Continued from *Modern Language Review*, Vol. IV, p. 322.

[2] Cf. B. Golz, *Die Pfalzgräfin Genoveva in der deutschen Dichtung*, Leipzig, 1897, p. 107.

[3] Criticism of *Ludovico*, 1848. (Hebbel's *Sämmtliche Werke* herausgegeben von R. M. Werner, XI, 247.) This edition of Hebbel's works is referred to in the following pages as *S. W.*; the *Tagebücher* and *Briefwechsel* in the same edition as *Tb.* and *Bw.* respectively.

[4] Introduction to *Die Nibelungen* (*S. W.*, IV, 5).

[5] Letter of Aug. 20, 1853 (*B. W.*, V, 123).

relating to Törring's play[1]. Published in 1780 it obtained an instantaneous success at its first representation at Mannheim in 1781, was classed by contemporary critics as equal if not superior to Goethe's *Götz*, and called forth many imitations. The reasons for this success are not far to seek: the play united the sentimentality of the eighteenth century with the patriotism of *Götz*, and was above all rooted in the 'Sturm und Drang.' The subject itself, the love of a nobleman for a girl of low degree, was a favourite one with the dramatists of the period, and the technique is also that of the 'Sturm und Drang.' But in one important point Törring is not a 'Stürmer und Dränger'; as a patriotic statesman, he saw the necessity of the individual submitting to the welfare of the State, and has given definite expression to his views. Brahm (p. 47) has shown that in the first two acts the individualistic standpoint is predominant, that Törring's sympathy is entirely on the side of the lovers, and that Ernst is depicted as an embittered father and unscrupulous autocrat. But when the poet reaches the middle of Act III, an entire change seems to have come over his views[2]; with the entry of Gundelfing and still more with that of Kaspar der Thorringer, who voices the opinions of his descendant, prominence is given to duty and patriotism; here for the first time we hear that Albrecht has a higher duty than that towards Agnes. This change of motive necessitated, above all, an alteration in the character of Ernst; he could no longer be an unscrupulous tyrant, he must desire the good of his country above all else and unwillingly sacrifice Agnes for the good of Bavaria. But Törring does not push this theory to its logical conclusion and make Ernst entirely responsible for the murder. He avoided the difficulty involved in the reconciliation of father and son (if the former alone is guilty) by shifting the blame on to the Vicedom and robbing the character of Ernst of all unity. The duke is at one time a passionate tyrant, at another a weak tool in the hands of his ministers, and finally an enlightened monarch actuated by the same motives as Hebbel's Ernst.

Thus it is evident that Hebbel found one of the main ideas of his drama, namely the subordination of the individual to the welfare of the State, treated, although inadequately, by his predecessor, and it was just this inadequate treatment which incited Hebbel to write a drama in which the same idea should be carried through consistently.

[1] Cf. O. Brahm, *Das deutsche Ritterdrama des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts.* (*Quellen und Forschungen*, 40.) Strassburg, 1880.

[2] Cf. Brahm, p. 46, for an hypothesis to account for this seeming inconsistency in Törring's drama.

As in the older play, Albrecht and Agnes represent the individualistic standpoint but, unlike Törring, Hebbel has made Ernst the consistent representative of the State, to which all individual interests must be sacrificed. Ernst is entirely responsible for the murder, and Hebbel does not need to shift the blame on to a stage villain[1], for he is quite prepared to carry his convictions to the bitter end, even to the much criticised reconciliation scene at the close of Act v. To sum up. Hebbel took over the main idea underlying Törring's drama, but found it necessary to make considerable alterations in the plot and characters, Otto Ludwig on the other hand proceeded in exactly the opposite way. Unlike Hebbel he fully approved of Törring's technique[2], and followed him in all his Agnes Bernauer dramas as regards intrigue and artificiality of plot, but was very little, if at all, influenced by Törring's emphasis of the importance of the State.

With regard to sources, Törring has stated in the introduction to his play that he followed Oeffele's *Scriptores rerum boicarum*; it is also extremely probable that he consulted Falckenstein's history, and as Hebbel also used that work, some of the agreements between Törring and Hebbel may be traced to a common source.

Turning now to a more detailed comparison of the two dramas, we are struck by the fact that there is the greatest divergence in the commencement. Hebbel devotes two whole acts to the love story[3], while Törring's play opens after the marriage has already taken place. Hebbel saw in this omission of the 'Vorgeschichte' an admission on Törring's part of his inability to treat the subject adequately. 'Seine Auffassung des Gegenstandes...steht im vollkommenen Einklang mit den Mitteln, die er aufzubieten hatte. Darum stellt er das Liebes-Verhältniss, für das ihm die Farben fehlten, nebst dem Abschluss in der Heirath, gleich in der ersten Scene fertig hin[4].' We notice exactly the same difference in Hebbel's and Schiller's treatment of the Demetrius theme. Here again Hebbel traces the origin of the relationship between hero and heroine and the development of their characters,

[1] It may be noted here that we find the trace of a villain, and perhaps of a former and more artificial plot, in Agnes's denunciation of Emeran Nusperger zu Kalmperg in Act v, sc. 3, of Hebbel's drama. It is a pity Hebbel has not cleared up this episode, for Nusperger is one of the three judges who has condemned Agnes, and on whose integrity Ernst lays so much weight. Cf. Hebbel's *Ausgewählte Werke*, herausgegeben von R. Specht (*Cottasche Bibliothek*), III, 193.

[2] Ludwig's *Nachlassschriften*, herausgegeben v. M. Heydrich, I, Leipzig, 1874, pp. 253 f.

[3] In his letter of Aug. 17, 1853, Gutzkow blames Hebbel's procedure: 'dramatisch sind die beiden ersten Acte derselben Sache zu viel' (Hebbel's *Briefwechsel*, herausgegeben von Bamberg, II, 153).

[4] Letter of Jan. 26, 1852 (*Bw.*, IV, 346).

and blames Schiller for pursuing an opposite course. 'Er [Schiller] setzt hier, wie immer, Alles voraus und giebt sich nie damit ab, die Wurzeln der Menschen und der Dinge bloss zu legen; so ist Marina vom ersten Moment an die eingefleischte Herrschsucht[1].' Thus Hebbel's divergence from Törring in this respect is based on one of the fundamental rules of his art. 'überall soll der Dichter ökonomisch sein, nur nicht in den Grundmotiven[2].'

Although Törring has not put the actual 'Vorgeschichte' on the stage, he has nevertheless given hints as to how it might have been treated in the second scene of Act I of his play, when the lovers recall their emotions at their first meeting, and Hebbel has followed the lines indicated. In his drama we also find 'die arme Bürgerstochter...in der Demuth ihres Standes, ringend mit der Tugend...ringend mit der Vernunft, dass sie's nicht wage einen Herzog zu lieben'; we also notice 'das ehrwürdig Misstrauen des alten Vaters,' who finally gives his consent and blessing. Only one or two passages in the first two acts of Hebbel's *Agnes Bernauer* are slightly reminiscent of Törring.

Act I, sc. 14. Emphasis is laid on the fact that Albrecht does not take his sword with him on leaving the inn; the passage gains in clearness on reference to Törring (Act III, sc. 3), where one of the charges brought against Albrecht at the tournament is that he walked about the streets of Augsburg without a sword.

Act II, sc. 10: 'Wenn du...dich dankbar zeigen willst, so nenne mich zum erstenmal du.' In connection with this passage it is interesting to note that in Törring's play Agnes, as is only natural considering the prejudices of the time, is much more sensible of her inferiority towards Albrecht, and throughout the play addresses him as 'Ihr,' while he calls her 'Du.' Immediately after the marriage (Act I, sc. 2) she asks whether she may call him by his Christian name, but does not dare to use the second person singular.

At the commencement of the third act of Hebbel's drama Agnes and Albrecht are married and, as is to be expected, the resemblances to Törring are greater. Of course Hebbel is bound to be more concise, as he has devoted two acts to the relationship of Albrecht and Agnes before their marriage, and practically has to get the same matter into three acts, which Törring spreads over five.

Ernst's two deliberations with Preising at the commencement of Acts III and IV are slightly reminiscent of Törring, inasmuch as he,

[1] Letter of Oct. 2, 1858 (*Bw.*, VI, 204).
[2] Quoted by Bamberg in his edition of Hebbel's *Werke*, VI, p. xiii.

influenced no doubt by Falckenstein's repeated references to Ernst's 'Räte,' has a liking for council-scenes. He has adopted the very clumsy expedient of closing each of the first three acts with a discussion between the duke and his counsellors; that at the close of Act II is particularly improbable and very undramatic, as all the people go out and leave Ernst and his advisers to debate in the empty 'Turnierplatz.' Hebbel is much more natural and consistent, his council scenes bear more resemblance to Goethe's than to Törring's. As in *Egmont,* the ruler twice asks the advice of a single trusted counsellor; Ernst's discussion of State affairs with Preising (Act III, sc. 6) in particular bears a marked likeness to a similar scene between Egmont and his secretary[1]. In the course of this scene we notice that Ernst in Hebbel's, no less than in Törring's play, expects implicit obedience from his son in the matter of his marriage. We might have expected that such an enlightened prince as Hebbel depicts, would at least have consulted his son before selecting a wife for him, but this is not the case: 'Wird Albrecht einverstanden sein? Darnach hab' ich wahrhaftig noch nicht gefragt, das denk' ich versteht sich von selbst' and again, 'er sagt ja, ob gern oder ungern—das kümmert mich nicht' (Act III, sc. 6). As regards the whole question of Albrecht's second marriage, Törring seems to have been the first to mention Anna von Braunschweig (whom the historical Albrecht subsequently married) during the Agnes Bernauer episode; in his drama Anna is proposed to Albrecht as a suitable wife and he refuses to marry her. In one of Törring's sources, namely Oeffele[2], the following statement occurs: 'differebat ducere uxorem legitimam'; on the strength of this passage Törring introduced Anna, and has been followed by Lipowsky, who enlarged on Törring and formed the immediate source of Hebbel's treatment of the incident[3].

Act III, sc. 10: Preising summons Albrecht to the tournament and tries to persuade him to submit to the wishes of his father, renounce Agnes and marry Anna. This scene is modelled on two similar scenes in Törring's drama, namely Act I, sc. 5, in which Preising summons Albrecht to the tournament, and Act III, sc. 5 and 6, in which Gundelfing and Kaspar der Thorringer both remind Albrecht of his duties towards his country. A few resemblances may be noted, as they serve to show that Törring's play was in Hebbel's mind when

[1] *Egmont*, Act II, sc. 2.
[2] Quoted by F. J. Lipowsky, *Agnes Bernauerinn*, Munich, 1800, p. 93.
[3] Cf. *Modern Language Review*, Vol. IV, 311.

writing. Both scenes (Act III, sc. 10, of Hebbel, and Act I, sc. 5, of Törring) open with a reference to a 'fröhliche Botschaft,' in both Albrecht is surprised at the short notice given of the tournament—'Das kommt ja rascher zu Stande als eine Bauernschlägerei' (Hebbel); 'Wann ist das Turnier? Morgen fängt's an. Und heute beruft man mich, ist das Rittersitte? (Törring)—but nevertheless declares his willingness to take part: 'Ich will um eine Erbsenschote turnieren' (Hebbel); 'Ihr sollt mich kämpfen sehen um nichts' (Törring); in both dramas Albrecht has to depart on the same day, takes a hasty farewell of his wife, and leaves one of his friends to protect her during his absence.

Act III, sc. 13: It has already been shown[1] that Törring first invented the tournament scene, that Lipowsky enlarged on it and was closely followed by Hebbel as far as the general structure is concerned. But in a few minor details Hebbel has been immediately influenced by Törring. The stage directions in both plays are very much alike, thus for example Albrecht attacks one of the officials and is struck by Ernst.

Hebbel.	*Törring.*
Albrecht zieht und dringt auf den Marschall ein...Ernst schlägt ihm mit der Faust aufs Schwert.	Albrecht zieht und schlägt den Vicedom mit dem Rücken des Schwertes... Ernst schlägt. Albrecht ebenso.

Towards the close of the scene there are several verbal agreements, especially when Albrecht calls on the people for help.

Hebbel.	*Törring.*
(*Albrecht*) Otto mein Ahnherr für Treu.	
(*Ernst*) Das Turnier ist aus.	(*Albrecht*) Das Turnier ist aus....
(*Albrecht*) Nein, es beginnt ...Bürger und Bauern heran.	Auf meine Bayern, wer Ottens Enkel liebt !...folge mir.
	(Menge Ritter und Volk umstehen Albrechten.)

Ernst's declaration of Adolf as his successor is absolutely unhistorical, and is not to be found in any of Hebbel's sources. Törring's Act I, sc. 7, may be compared: 'so soll Bayern wissen, dass Ernst keinen Sohn mehr hat.' Taken as a whole, Hebbel's tournament scene contrasts most favourably with that of his predecessor; it is remarkable for its brevity, the steps follow upon one another logically, and the points borrowed from Törring and Lipowsky are used to the greatest advantage. Albrecht is forced to declare his marriage, and is at once disinherited. Törring's scene is long and rambling in comparison, and

[1] *Modern Language Review*, Vol. IV, 311 f.

as Albrecht is dishonoured whether he has married Agnes or not, he has no particular reason for announcing his marriage.

In the latter part of the fourth act and the whole of the fifth the similarity of construction between the two plays is very marked. This will be clear from the following tabulation:

Hebbel.	*Törring.*
Act IV, sc. 7.	Act IV, sc. 5—8.
Farewell of Albrecht and Agnes.	Farewell of Albrecht and Agnes.
Graf Törring left for her protection.	Zenger left for her protection.
Sc. 10. Interview of Agnes and Theobald.	Sc. 8. Tuchsenhauser tries to persuade Agnes to renounce Albrecht; she obstinately refuses (cp. Hebbel, Act V, sc. 2).
Sc. 11—12. Castle taken by treachery; fighting on stage; Törring falls; Agnes taken prisoner.	Sc. 9—11. Castle taken by treachery; fighting on stage; Zenger falls; Agnes taken prisoner.
Act V.	Act V.
	Sc. 1. Interview of the Vicedom with Tuchsenhauer.
Sc. 1. Agnes' monologue in prison.	Sc. 2. Agnes' monologue in prison.
Sc. 2. Preising tries to persuade Agnes to renounce Albrecht, but she obstinately refuses. (Cp. Törring, Act IV, sc. 8.)	
	Sc. 3, 4. Trial of Agnes.
Sc. 4—7. Ernst hears of the murder; description of the deed.	Sc. 5. Albrecht hears of Agnes' imprisonment.
	Sc. 6. Agnes drowned on the stage.
Sc. 8—10. Albrecht swears revenge, but is ultimately reconciled to his father, who reminds him of his duty to Bavaria.	Sc. 8. Albrecht swears revenge, but is ultimately reconciled to his father, who reminds him of his duty to Bavaria.
Embassy from the Emperor. Abdication of Ernst.	
Ernst decrees a perpetual mass at Agnes' tomb, and refers to her as 'das reinste Opfer der Notwendigheit.'	Ernst decrees a perpetual mass at Agnes' tomb, and refers to her as 'Schlachtopfer des Staats.'

Only a few points call for notice: (1) In Törring's drama the attempt to persuade Agnes to renounce her husband is made before she is in the power of her enemies, while with Hebbel the same attempt is made immediately before the murder; in both dramas Agnes's refusal leads up to the catastrophe, in the one case (Törring) to the storming of the castle, in the other to the execution. The scenes, as is to be expected, have several features in common; for example, both ambassadors exceed their orders: 'ich gehe vielleicht schon weiter als ich darf' (Hebbel); 'vielleicht hab' ich schon mehr gesagt, als der Würde dessen, der mich gesandt hat...anstund' (Törring).

(2) Törring has given a trial scene; in Hebbel's drama this was not necessary, as according to him Agnes had been condemned by legal experts two and a half years previously.

(3) Törring represents the actual drowning of Agnes on the stage, Hebbel is content with a description of the deed.

(4) Hebbel has followed Törring in one respect, which has been severely criticised, namely in letting the reconciliation between father and son take place immediately after the murder. With Törring this reconciliation is much more probable, inasmuch as Ernst is not alone responsible, Albrecht believes that his father would have prevented the execution if he had come in time[1].

(5) Both dukes rather meanly sacrifice their subordinates, who were only carrying out their instructions; Torring's Ernst the Vicedom and Hebbel's duke Pappenheim and Haydeck, who fall victims to Albrecht's first paroxysms of rage.

In conclusion it may be noted that there are more changes of scenery and more scenic descriptions in *Agnes Bernauer* than in Hebbel's other plays; this may be due to the influence of Törring, who, in the manner of the 'Sturm und Drang,' had no scruples as to changing the scene as often as it suited him, and delighted in descriptions. It should, however, be also borne in mind that Hebbel considered that a drama on national history necessitated more scenic descriptions, as the poet could reckon on an interest of the people in their own past.

IV.

The Influence of Kleist.

Hebbel's individuality and independence of thought are so pronounced that it is difficult indeed to trace the influence of another poet in his works. We are, however, not justified in going as far as Grillparzer[2], who absolutely denied that any one, not even excepting Goethe, could have at all influenced Hebbel, for the poet has himself told us how great was the debt he owed to Schiller and Uhland in his youth and, above all, he has repeatedly acknowledged his indebtedness to Heinrich von Kleist. To give but two examples: in his student days at Munich Hebbel announced his intention of following Kleist in

[1] Törring is very inconsistent here, for if it was necessary for the good of Bavaria that Agnes should die, why did Ernst wish to prevent the deed at the last?

[2] Entry of Sept. 10, 1861 (*Tb.*, IV, 202).

that psychological method which was so peculiarly well suited to his own genius: 'Kleist ist, so weit man ein Muster haben kann, mein Muster...er zeichnet immer das Innere und das Äussere zugleich, Eins durch das Andere, und das ist das allein Rechte[1]'; and in 1855 when Heine designated him as being 'de la parenté intellectuelle de Kleist,' Hebbel willingly admitted the justice of the comparison; 'ich rechne mir die Verwandtschaft mit Kleist nur zur Ehre....Kleist hat sogar direct auf mich gewirkt, wenn auch nicht auf meine Dramen, sondern auf meine Erzählungen[2].' There seems however to be no reason for thus limiting Kleist's influence to Hebbel's novels, on the contrary it may be even possible to trace a connection between *Agnes Bernauer* and Kleist's dramatic work.

In considering the possible influence of any one drama, *Käthchen von Heilbronn* at once occurs to the mind, for this play also treats of a mediæval subject and centres in a daughter of the people.

It may further be recalled that Hebbel admitted that his ballad of *Schön Hedwig* was modelled on Kleist's heroine ('Schön Hedwig... hat dem Käthchen von Heilbronn seinen besten Putz abgeborgt[3]'), and that in 1847 he thought of taking up the 'Grundmotiv' of Kleist's drama, 'dass die Liebe, die Alles opfert, Alles gewinnt[4],' and of carrying it through consistently without the 'phantastische Räder und Federn[5],' which in his opinion detracted from the value of *Käthchen*. But Hebbel did not carry out his plan, and we have already seen that, as far as *Agnes Bernauer* is concerned, he took quite another Ritterdrama, namely that of Graf Törring, and worked out a totally different idea from that underlying *Käthchen von Heilbronn*. In his manner of treating a mediæval theme Hebbel also does not seem to have been at all influenced by Kleist. Neither the technique, in which his predecessor had closely followed the old Ritterdramen, nor the romantic *milieu* of Kleist's play, at all appealed to Hebbel. The scenes in *Käthchen* are very loosely strung together, and there are plenty of irrevelant episodes, but Kleist has succeeded in infusing the spirit of true poetry into the eighteenth century Ritterdrama. *Agnes Bernauer*, on the other hand, is admirably constructed, every episode is closely connected with the whole, although Hebbel has certainly not been able to endow his heroine with any of Käthchen's charm. Kleist has

[1] Letter of May 23, 1837 (*Bw.*, I, 203).
[2] Letter of March 19, 1855 (*Bw.*, V, 220).
[3] Letter of June 21, 1853 (*Bw.*, V, 109).
[4] Entry of August 29, 1847 (*Tb.*, III, 267).
[5] Letter of Sept. 6, 1861 (*Bw.*, VII, 69).

drawn a living figure; Käthchen is truly national, and takes her place beside Klärchen and Gretchen[1], while Agnes, for all her sweetness, is absolutely passive and colourless, except in the few scenes where her honour is at stake.

When Hebbel later in life re-read *Käthchen*, he was as much delighted with its poetic qualities as in the days of his youth, but he could not give the drama the same whole-hearted admiration as formerly; its chief fault lay in his eyes in the aristocratic prejudices of its author[2]. Wetter vom Strahl ought, in Hebbel's opinion, to have been willing to marry Käthchen before he knew that she was the daughter of the Emperor. In other words, Hebbel blames Kleist's hero for not acting as Herzog Albrecht and sacrificing everything to love. But Kleist had no desire to face the Agnes Bernauer problem; he wished above all to secure the happiness of his heroine, and this was impossible unless she was nobly born, 'und so siegst Du (Käthchen) nicht durch Dich selbst...Du siegst durch eine Pergamentrolle, durch den kaiserlichen Brief, der Dich zur Princessin von Schwaben erhebt[3].'

Already in his Hamburg treatise on Kleist and Körner, written as far back as 1836[4], Hebbel specially singles out *Der Prinz von Homburg*, 'das gelungenste aller Kleist'schen Stücke,' for careful analysis and enthusiastic praise. And in his criticism of 1849[5], written a few years before the conception of *Agnes Bernauer*, he again submits the play to a searching analysis, expresses his disapproval of the Romantic setting, but shows that it does not in any way detract from the value of the drama. It is easy to see what specially attracted Hebbel to Kleist's last creation, for more than any other of his dramas it is pre-eminently psychological, 'es steht unerschütterlich auf festen psychologischen Füssen, und die Wucherpflanzen der Romantik haben sich nur als überflüssige Arabesken herumgeschlungen[6].' Never before had Kleist been so true to life as in his last drama, the whole interest of which, strictly speaking, centres round the mental development of the hero; and the reason for this is not far to seek: Kleist himself is Homburg, and is depicting a change that actually took place in his own mind. At the beginning of his poetic career he had been an individualist, a dreamer who had blindly followed his instincts and emotions, but the political troubles of the time had shown him the

[1] Cf. Otto Brahm, *Heinrich von Kleist*, Berlin, 1884, p. 256.
[2] Entry of Feb. 21, 1845 (*Tg.* III, 21 ff.).
[3] Entry of Feb. 21, 1845 (*Tg.*, III, 24).
[4] *S. W.*, IX, 40 ff.
[5] *S. W.*, XI, 323 ff.
[6] *S. W.*, XI, 323.

importance of subordinating individual interests to the welfare of the State. And this brings us to the second point which specially appealed to Hebbel, namely the main idea underlying Kleist's drama, which closely connects it with *Agnes Bernauer*.

In 1836 Hebbel had already noted as the most important passage in the play Homburg's expostulation to Kottwitz[1]:

> Auf Ordr'? Ei Kottwitz! Reitest du so langsam?
> Hast du sie noch vom Herzen nicht empfangen?[2]

And he explains that in the commencement 'die Kraft steht über dem Gesetz und der Muth erkennt keine Schranken als sich selbst[3],' but at the close of the drama, when Homburg's moral regeneration ('Läuterung') is completed, he clearly recognizes his duties towards society. As this is the same idea which, according to the poet's own statement, is to be found in all his earlier dramas[4]—though expressed in none so clearly as in *Agnes Bernauer*—and as he already admired it in Kleist's work in 1836, we are certainly justified in assuming that Kleist was one of the first writers definitely to make clear to Hebbel the importance of submission on the part of the individual when the good of society is at stake. Graf Törring preaches the same idea vaguely and inconsistently, but Hebbel found it clearly expressed and consistently carried through in Kleist's drama. Homburg starts by being as great an individualist as Herzog Albrecht, not ready from the first, as Max Piccolomini, to sacrifice inclination to duty, and he ends by making even a greater sacrifice than Herzog Ernst for the good of the State.

As if to accentuate the resemblance to Albrecht, Hebbel lays particular stress on the fact that Homburg, like the Bavarian duke, was warned before his rash deed: 'Nichts desto weniger erfährt er durch seinen Freund Hohenzollern auf's genaueste, was der Dienst von ihm verlangt; doch was hilft's...er denkt nur an die Lorbeeren und an das Mädchen, dem er sie zu Füssen legen will, nicht an die Pflicht und an das Vaterland[5].' The likeness to Albrecht is unmistakable, especially if we—as Hebbel would have done—free the character of Kleist's prince from all romantic and somnambulistic attributes. On closer examination the means employed by both dramatists in educating the young princes to a sense of duty will also be found to have much in common. The main difference lies in the fact that, as already noted, Kleist's whole

[1] *S. W.*, IX, 39.
[2] *Prinz von Homburg*, Act II, sc. 2.
[3] *S. W.*, IX, 40.
[4] Letter of Feb. 16, 1852 (*Bw.*, IV, 359).
[5] *S. W.*, XI, 325.

drama is taken up with the conversion of the hero, he depicts the different stages with psychological exactitude, while in Hebbel's play Albrecht is changed from an ardent lover who lays the greatest stress on his own personal happiness to a monarch who sacrifices all for the sake of his subjects in one scene.

At the first performance of *Agnes Bernauer* a critic already noted the resemblance of Herzog Ernst to the Kurfürst in *Homburg*[1], and certainly the similarity is very marked. Both are enlightened sovereigns, who sacrifice all personal interests to the welfare of the State, both lay stress on the fact that they are no tyrants—compare: (*Ernst*) 'Ich bin kein Tyrann, und denke keiner zu werden[2],' with: (*Kurfürst*) 'Mein süsses Kind! Sieh,' wär' ich ein Tyrann, Dein Wort, das fühl' ich lebhaft, hätte mir Das Herz schon in der ehrnen Brust geschmelzt[3]'—and on the fact that they sign the death sentence only as a duty.

Although Hebbel strongly disapproved of the judgment of a contemporary critic: 'Ernst experimentirt an seinem Sohn herum[4],' he certainly held the opinion that the Kurfürst is trying to educate Homburg from the very beginning of the play: 'es ist kein Zufall, wenn der Churfürst ihm einen Posten anwies, der ihn mit seinen Leidenschaften und den Forderungen seines Blutes in Widerspruch bringen muss, er soll Beide eben bekämpfen lernen[5].' Again, and this is surely more than a chance resemblance, the regeneration of the hero is completed in both dramas by precisely the same method. If Homburg has to acknowledge the justice of the death sentence, Albrecht is also forced to judge the duke's action, and although a year elapses before he gives his decision, we are convinced that he will admit his father to have been perfectly justified in bringing about the death of Agnes.

Hebbel has himself pointed out the essential difference between his drama and Kleist's when he praises *Der Prinz von Homburg*, 'weil in ihm durch die blossen Schauer des Todes...erreicht worden ist, was in allen übrigen Tragödien nur durch den Tod selbst erreicht wird: die sittliche Läuterung und Verklärung des Helden[6].' *Der Prinz von Homburg* stops short before the death of the hero, so the reconciliation is quite probable, and the Kurfürst retains our entire sympathy, while in *Agnes Bernauer* on the other hand, although Hebbel may have convinced us of the necessity of the murder, we cannot approve of

[1] *Bw.*, VIII, 101.
[2] *Agnes Bernauer*, Act IV, sc. 4.
[3] *Der Prinz von Homburg*, Act IV, sc. 1.
[4] Letter of Nov. 8, 1852 (*Bw.*, V, 73).
[5] *S. W.*, XI, 325.
[6] *S. W.*, XI, 323.

Ernst's conduct owing to our pity for Agnes[1], and we feel inclined to censure rather than admire Albrecht for so speedily becoming reconciled to his father. Grillparzer, when facing a similar problem in *Die Jüdin von Toledo*, got over the difficulty by lowering the character of the heroine. But this Hebbel would never have done, for he was intent on proving that the 'Grundidee' underlying his drama holds good under all circumstances, and therefore purposely chose an extreme case without considering the prejudices of his audience. Here we are face to face with another characteristic of Hebbel's work, and one which again shows his resemblance to Kleist, who also pushed his ideas to their logical conclusion with the same relentlessness and disregard of conventionality as his successor. If Hebbel expected his audience to sympathise with the murderer of a perfectly innocent woman, Kleist in his desire for psychological realism did not shrink from letting his hero appear on the stage as 'ein unerfreulich jammernswürd'ger Anblick[2].'

To sum up, the influence of Kleist on *Agnes Bernauer* may be traced in the idea underlying the drama, in Hebbel's psychological method, and especially in the means by which the moral regeneration of the hero is brought about.

V.

Hebbel's Deviations from History.

Although Hebbel did not as a general rule attach much importance to a faithful reproduction of the past[3], there are frequent indications in his correspondence that in *Agnes Bernauer*, his only drama on German history, he prided himself on his historical accuracy. Thus he writes to Dingelstedt: 'ich habe eine einfach rührende, menschlich schöne Handlung, treu und schlicht, wie der Chronist sie überliefert, in die Mitte gestellt[4]'; and in his interview with the king of Bavaria, he laid special stress on the historical accuracy of his drama, as compared with Törring's: 'ich habe das Thema streng historisch gefasst, mein Vorgänger aber nicht[5].' When contrasting his work with that of his predecessor, Hebbel was no doubt thinking not so much of the minor

[1] Cf. Bulthaupt, *Dramaturgie des Schauspiels*, III, Leipzig, 1904, pp. 174 ff., and S. Friedmann, *Das deutsche Drama des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig, 1902, p. 185 ff.
[2] *Der Prinz von Homburg*, Act IV, sc. 1.
[3] *Modern Language Review*, IV, 308.
[4] Letter of Dec. 12, 1851 (*Bw.*, IV, 337).
[5] Cf. E. Kuh, *Biographie Hebbels*, Vienna and Leipzig, 1907, II, 342.

'kulturgeschichtliche' details, which he used so extensively in depicting the *milieu*, and which compare most favourably with Törring's vague 'ritterliche Zeit,' as of his rejection of the unhistorical intrigue; for there can be no doubt that Hebbel was perfectly in accordance with fact, when he made the Duke fully responsible for the murder. But if we examine *Agnes Bernauer* more closely, the conclusion is forced upon us that Hebbel is no more true to history in this than in his other dramas. Before, however, proceeding to examine Hebbel's deviations from history in detail it may be advisable to endeavour to account for the impression of modernity produced by the drama as a whole.

Hebbel certainly has not, as for example Kleist in *Der Prinz von Homburg*, repudiated any effort to arrive at historical accuracy; but on the other hand he has not given that perfect embodiment of the spirit of the age which is so admirable in Kleist. Although the principal persons and events of Hebbel's drama are historical, yet notwithstanding the mass of detail with which the poet tried to reproduce the period, the problems and characters are not those of the fifteenth century. As in Ibsen's earlier historical dramas, the background of the play is mediæval, but the foreground modern. Both poets' interest in psychology was so much stronger than their interest in history that they laid more stress on the struggle in the mind of the individual than on the historical event. As in *Kongsemnerne* Skule mainly interested Ibsen, so Ernst first attracted Hebbel to the story of Agnes Bernauer[1]; but both Earl Skule and Herzog Ernst are thoroughly modern figures. There can be no doubt that Ernst is as great an anachronism in the Middle Ages as Golo[2] is, though Ernst is much more sympathetic and convincing. Theoretically Hebbel demanded that every character should be rooted in his time, but in practice he never seems to have realised that human beings are not the same in all ages; most surprising of all, this poet, who insisted so much on individuality, seems to have interpreted every character in the light of his own complicated psychological experience. Hebbel's characters, as a rule, bear a striking resemblance to the poet himself; they are always reflecting even when we should expect them to be exclusively taken up with external events. Thus many passages in Hebbel's dramas might be—and some actually are—taken from his

[1] Letter of Dec. 14, 1854 (*Bw.*, v, 205): 'Sie haben ganz recht, dass der Verfasser selbst auf der Seite des alten Herzogs steht und zwar so entschieden, dass nur dieser ihn für den ganzen Gegenstand entzündet hat.'

[2] Cf. B. Golz, l.c., p. 116: 'Golo...ist durch und durch modern, zerfressen von Reflexion.'

diaries. To select but one out of innumerable examples, could anything be more characteristic of Hebbel than Albrecht's reflection in the midst of a passionate love scene: 'All uns're Wollust mündet in Gott, was uns're enge Brust nicht fasst, das fluthet in die seinige hinüber, er ist nur glücklich, wenn wir selig sind, soll er nicht glücklich sein? Und zuweilen stösst er die Welle zurück, dann überströmt sie den Menschen, und er ist auf einmal dahin, wandelt im Paradiese und spürt keine Veränderung' (Act III, sc. 9). This resemblance to the poet applies in a higher degree to Herzog Ernst than to any other character Hebbel has created. Kulke has drawn attention to the striking similarity, 'So wie Ernst mit Preising spricht, also sprach Hebbel,' and he specially notes that Hebbel has endowed his prototype with one of his most characteristic traits: 'das Despotische in der Form der Gerechtigkeit[1].' So far has Hebbel gone in the identification of himself with Ernst, that he has put a Low German word such as 'twatsch' into the mouth of the Bavarian duke (Act III, sc. 6).

In considering in detail Hebbel's deviations from his sources, it will be observed that some changes were made for purposes of character delineation, others for the sake of motivation and colouring, but that the majority are concessions to the all powerful 'idea.' Thus it has already been noted that the emphasis laid on Agnes's position in Augsburg, when the play opens, and the introduction of her jealous friends, are closely connected with Hebbel's conception of the harmful effect of beauty on its surroundings. In a letter of August 1853, Gutzkow blames Hebbel for devoting two whole acts to Albrecht's wooing, but adds truly enough 'freilich die Augsburger Badestube hat für die Charakteristik zu viel Verlockendes gehabt[2].' It is to this desire of Hebbel to paint the *milieu* in which Agnes grew up that we owe the excellent figure of Caspar Bernauer, who is slightly reminiscent of Meister Anton in *Maria Magdalena*, and for which the poet has borrowed several traits from his own father. On the other hand the apprentice Theobald, who also bears witness to the misfortune that Agnes's beauty has brought upon the world, is distinctly related to Brackenburg[3].

Act I, sc. 15—18. There seems to have been a popular tradition that Albrecht first met Agnes at a dance[4]; Hebbel may have followed

[1] E. Kulke, *Erinnerungen an F. Hebbel*, Vienna, 1878, p. 13 f.
[2] *Hebbel's Briefwechsel*, herausgegeben v. F. Bamberg, Berlin, 1890, II, 153.
[3] Cf. also the unfortunate lover Ephraim in *Judith*.
[4] C. Meyer, *Agnes Bernauer im Lichte der neuesten geschichtlichen Forschung* (Westermann's *Ill. Monatshefte*, 1904, Nr 12).

this, but was more probably influenced by Stettin's description of the festivities in honour of the visit of Prince Philip to Augsburg in 1496[1]. Historically the scene is impossible, for the patricians would not have admitted the daughter of a 'Bader' to their dances. Hebbel must have been aware of this, for there are repeated references in Werlich and Stettin to a separate 'Tanzhaus für die Geschlechter' (for example, Stettin, pp. 153, 220, 258).

Act II. Only one invention in this act calls for notice. Several of Hebbel's sources, for example Mannert and Lipowsky, mention that Albrecht tried other means of gaining Agnes's love before offering her marriage. Hebbel, who has ennobled Albrecht, has let Graf Törring make the attempt.

Act III, sc. 1—6. In Ernst's discussion of State affairs with his Chancellor, his treatment of the Jews alone calls for notice. Nothing could be less mediæval than Ernst's methods of dealing with this problem, and Karl Werner relates that the application to modern conditions was clearly felt by the audience at a reading of *Agnes Bernauer*[2]. Another touch characteristic of Hebbel is the fact that Ernst builds the college of Andechs in extenuation for the sins of his youth. In reality this college was not built until several years after the death of Agnes Bernauer[3]; Hebbel's reason for altering the date will be seen later.

Act III, sc. 10—13. Hebbel's motivation of the scene of the tournament is far superior to that of any of his sources. According to Törring and Lipowsky the tournament is held to recall Albrecht to a sense of honour by degrading him publicly. In Hebbel's drama Ernst holds the tournament to announce Albrecht's engagement to Anna von Braunschweig, and so silence the rumours of his relations with Agnes. He only refuses his son admission as a last resort on his absolute refusal to comply with his father's wishes. Albrecht's declaration of his marriage follows as a matter of course, and then the duke, as conceived by Hebbel, has no alternative but to force Albrecht into 'private life[4]' by proclaiming his nephew heir to the dukedom. This proclamation is absolutely unhistorical and is probably the very last thing the real Ernst would have done, for it is the action of a modern prince imbued with Hebbel's notions of the responsibility of a ruler

[1] Cf. *Modern Language Review*, Vol. IV, p. 322.
[2] *Briefwechsel*, edited Bamberg, II, 42.
[3] Cf. K. Mannert, *Die Geschichte Bayerns*, Leipzig, 1826, p. 472, and J. H. von Falckenstein's *Geschichte...Baierns*, Munich, 1763, p. 458.
[4] Letter of Nov. 8, 1852 (*Bw.*, V, 73).

to his subjects, and ready to make every sacrifice for their welfare. Quite a modern touch is Hebbel's deviation with regard to the striking of Albrecht. Several of his sources, for example Törring and Falkenstein, state that the duke struck his son on this occasion. In the drama Ernst in his first burst of rage on hearing of the marriage rushes towards Albrecht, but quickly controls himself with the reflection, 'was erhitzt der Vater sich, der Herzog genügt.'

Act IV, sc. 1—4. In this act several important deviations claim our attention, for it is in the first scenes that Hebbel tries to convince us that Ernst was absolutely obliged, even from a modern point of view, to bring about the death of Agnes, and he could only achieve this object by deviating considerably from his sources. At the commencement of the act Preising is discovered reading the death sentence of Agnes, which according to Hebbel was drawn up by impartial legal experts immediately after her marriage. The poet has himself admitted that this sentence is absolutely unhistorical, 'Übrigens werden Sie in der Bairischen Geschichte...das Rechtsgutachten meines Stücks nicht finden[1].' Kulke has recorded a remark of Hebbel's on this subject, which illustrates how very little value he attached to historical accuracy when it was a question of working out an idea. 'Als ob dadurch, dass zwei oder drei Professoren in einem alten Archive eine Urkunde entdecken, welche zufällig das vom Dichter benutzte Moment historisch beglaubigt und sicher stellt, an dem inneren Zusammenhang, an der Motivierung des Dramas irgend etwas gebessert oder überhaupt geändert würde[2].' Hebbel names the legal authorities, who have drawn up this imaginary deed—Kraitmayr, mentioned by Falckenstein as having written a defence of the murder, Adlzreiter[3] and Emeran Nusperger zu Kalmberg, whose unsuitability for the task has already been noticed. We now come to the second fact, which according to Hebbel justified Ernst in committing the murder, namely the death of the little Prince Adolf. In this point also Hebbel is at variance with his sources, all of whom definitely affirm that Adolf died in 1437, that is, several years after the drowning of Agnes. Lipowsky, when speaking of the poisoning charge brought against Agnes (p. 29), lays emphasis on the fact that Adolf survived her, so Hebbel must

[1] Letter of Dec. 14, 1854 (*Bw.*, v, 206).

[2] Kulke, *Erinnerungen an Hebbel*, p. 12.

[3] It is interesting to note in this connection that Riezler is very indignant at the mention of Kraitmayr and Adlzreiter, 'dass Hebbel aber Adlzreiter und Kreitmayr als Räte Ernsts ein juristisches Gutachten über den Fall verfassen lässt, übersteigt doch jedes Maas poetischer Licenz.' S. Riezler, *Untersuchungen über Agnes Bernauer und die baierischen Herzöge* (*Sitzungsber. der Münchener Akademie*, 1885, xv, p. 302).

have known that in this respect also he was quite unhistorical. This and the preceding point strike at the root of Hebbel's theory that the poet often represents history more faithfully than the historian, for the historical Ernst really had no justification for murdering his son's wife beyond that, as Riezler points out[1], of keeping the dukedom in the hands of his descendants, a reason which Hebbel would most certainly not have considered adequate. Again, if Adolf survived Agnes, God could not have indicated to Ernst the path to be followed. In a word, it is quite evident that Hebbel knowingly altered the facts in order to make them fit into his theories.

Next comes the question of the accusation of poisoning brought against Agnes. In the drama Agnes is accused of witchcraft by the people, and is supposed to have brought about the death of Duke Wilhelm, his wife and their son Adolf. Ernst according to Hebbel does not for an instant believe in the poisoning charge, 'es ist thörigt, mit den gemeinen Leuten von Zauberei zu reden, wo ein Gesicht, das unser Herrgott zwei Mal angestrichen hat, Alles erklärt' (Act v, sc. 6), but is forced very much against his will to sacrifice Agnes for the sake of his subjects; he writes to the Emperor *before the murder*, explaining his motives and asking him to interfere, if necessary, to restore Albrecht to a sense of his responsibilities. Now the historical Ernst also wrote to the emperor concerning Agnes Bernauer, but from quite different motives. At the end of his book Lipowsky has quoted several historical documents, among them Ernst's instructions to his chancellor, when sent on a mission to the Emperor fourteen days *after the murder*. Riezler has pointed out[2] that these instructions certainly do not place Ernst in a very favourable light. They were written after Albrecht had joined Ludwig of Ingolstadt, and Ernst was desirous of securing the Emperor's protection by giving his version of the murder. He is evidently fully aware of the unrighteousness of the deed, and in order to defend his conduct he brings charges against Agnes, which he must have been aware were absolutely unfounded, thus he tells the Emperor that she was 'ein böses Weib' who tried to poison not only Albrecht (her own husband!), but also his nephew Adolf. The duke, who must have known that Adolf had been weak from infancy, plainly showed how little he himself believed in these charges, when he subsequently joined his son in decreeing a perpetual mass to the memory of Agnes. Could anything be more unlike Hebbel's conception of Ernst than his

[1] l.c. p. 302.
[2] S. Riezler, *Bairische Geschichte*, Gotha, 1889, III, 323.

historical namesake, who in the meanest way sought to stifle the voice of his conscience and gain the help of the emperor by blackening his victim after death? As Hebbel seems to have read Lipowsky most carefully, he must have read these instructions, especially as Lipowsky (p. 29) comments on the utter groundlessness of the poisoning charge and tries to excuse Ernst by the supposition that he was himself deceived. Hebbel must therefore have been fully aware how unhistorical was his conception of the duke. As there is no other reference to an accusation of poisoning in any of Hebbel's sources, it is probable that the fact that the Bavarians regarded Agnes as bringing destruction on the ducal house is an invention of the poet.

Act IV, sc. 6. As Ernst's proclamation of Adolf as his successor is unhistorical, it follows that Ernst did not endeavour to persuade his son to abdicate. There is also no reference in any source to Ernst persuading the Emperor not to call Albrecht to account for his disturbance of the peace at the tournament.

Act V, sc. 6. The fact that Hebbel does not agree with any of his sources in the account of Agnes's death may possibly point to another unknown source, but it is much more probable that Hebbel altered the actual details to fit in with his conception of Agnes, especially as he censures Melchior Meyer for not omitting details such as 'der gräuliche Zug von dem Henker, der freilich historisch ist, den aber doch gewiss nur ein mit Spiess und Kramer verwandtes Gemüth auf Nadeln stecken kann[1].'

Act V, sc. 8. It is rather difficult to see why Hebbel deviated from his sources as to the defeat of Ernst. The historical duke certainly was not utterly defeated by his son, and in the drama Ernst intends to overthrow Albrecht ('ich werfe ihn oder halte ihn auf, bis der Kaiser kommt', Act IV, sc. 4), makes most careful preparations to this effect, and yet is entirely defeated by Albrecht's hastily collected followers at the first onset.

Act V, sc. 10. The interference of the Emperor again is quite unhistorical, but is perfectly in agreement with Hebbel's conception of the drama, 'das Reich mit allen seinen Elementen, steht dahinter, wie ein ungeheurer Berg mit Donner und Blitz[2].' Ernst's abdication and retirement to a monastery is Hebbel's last great concession to the 'idea.' In discussing the ideas underlying the play it has already been noted[3] that the abdication of the monarch played an important part

[1] Letter of Jan. 26, 1852 (*Bw.*, IV, 347).
[2] Letter of Dec. 29, 1851 (*Bw.*, IV, 337).
[3] *Modern Language Review*, IV, 305.

in all Hebbel's plans of illustrating the tragic aspect of the kingship. Ernst's retirement into a monastery also explains Hebbel's motive for altering the date of the building of Andechs, to which reference has already been made. Quite apart from the ethical value of the idea, the question presents itself: was it a very prudent course from a practical point of view for Ernst to entrust the government of the dukedom to his inexperienced son and, above all, was it conducive to the welfare of the people, which Ernst, according to Hebbel, regarded more than all personal considerations?

The close of the drama was influenced by Kleist's *Prinz von Homburg*, and is of course absolutely unhistorical; after the lapse of a year Albrecht is to pronounce judgment on his father, and Ernst declares that he will submit to his decree.

In answer to a criticism of his *Nibelungen* trilogy, Hebbel expressed the opinion that slight deviations from history occasionally add to the beauty of a drama; 'ich zähle diese Anachronismen u.s.w. zu den kleinen Mysterien der Kranzwinderinnen, von denen behauptet wird, dass sie ganz zuletzt noch mit unbarmherzig rauher Hand über ihre sorgfältig zu Stande gebrachte bunte Schöpfung fahren, um ihr durch den Anschein der Nachlässigkeit grössere Natürlichkeit zu geben[1].' A few of these anachronisms, for which there is no reason except the whim or carelessness of the poet, are also to be found in *Agnes Bernauer*. Thus in Act I, sc. 18, the Bürgermeister of Augsburg introduces his niece Juliana Peutenger to Notthaft von Wernberg, and tells him that as a child of four years she welcomed the Emperor to Augsburg in a Latin speech. Stettin (p. 258) relates precisely the same incident under the year 1504, so Hebbel has altered the date by over seventy years. Other examples of inaccuracies which come under this heading are: (1) The question of the divorce of Margaretha Maultasch (Act IV, sc. 5), to which reference has already been made[2]. (2) The amount of money to be paid by the Duke of Würtemberg to Ernst as compensation for his daughter's elopement (Act III, sc. 6). Hebbel's sources fix the sum at 10,000 gulden[3], while the poet wrote first 30,000 gulden and then 25,000. (3) Death of Elizabeth the mother of Albrecht, who died 1432[4] (after Albrecht's marriage to Agnes); in the drama Albrecht (Act II, sc. 10) on the day of his first meeting with Agnes already speaks of his mother as dead.

There yet remains one important deviation for which it is very

[1] Letter of Dec. 2, 1858 (*Bw.*, VI, 215).
[2] *Modern Language Review*, IV, 317.
[3] For example Lipowsky, p. 9.
[4] Lipowsky, p. 87.

difficult to account. Hebbel notes under the names of the characters, 'Die Handlung ereignet sich zwischen 1420 und 1430,' yet every one of his sources, including Törring, places the murder of Agnes Bernauer considerably later (either in 1435 or 1436). It is evident that this one deviation must throw the entire chronology of the play into confusion; thus for example in 1430 Herzog Wilhelm was not dead, and the little Prince Adolf had not yet been born. The obvious explanation is, of course, that Hebbel made a mistake and wrote 1420–30 instead of 1430–40; but, on the other hand, it does not seem very probable that he would have overlooked the date of the heroine's death. As the explanations which might be suggested to account for the deviation are not at all satisfactory[1], it is just possible that Hebbel was following an unknown source.

In the course of the foregoing investigation of the sources of Hebbel's *Agnes Bernauer* it has been shown that the poet, according to his wont, started with the definite intention of giving poetic expression to several of his characteristic ideas, and carried out his purpose with the utmost consistency. The immediate stimulus doubtless came from the drama on the same subject by Graf Törring, whose inconsistent treatment of the character of Herzog Ernst especially revealed to Hebbel the psychological possibilities of the theme. Hebbel was influenced by Törring not only in the main trend of the drama, that is, in laying such stress on the subordination of the individual to the State, but also as regards *technique*, the similarity of construction being especially striking towards the close of the two plays. From Lipowsky's history of *Agnes Bernauerinn*, on the other hand, Hebbel borrowed the main plot of his drama, as well as many minor incidents. To Mannert's and Falckenstein's histories of Bavaria and to Stettin's and Werlich's chronicles, he was indebted for such historical facts as he thought necessary for a vivid delineation of the *milieu*. Finally, the influence of Kleist may be traced in Hebbel's psychological method, especially in the means by which the moral regeneration of the hero is brought about.

Agnes Löwenstein.

London.

[1] For example Lipowsky (pp. 15—73) distinctly states that the tournament at which Albrecht first saw Agnes took place in 1428, and in Hebbel's drama two and a half years are supposed to elapse between the marriage and death of Agnes (Act IV, sc. 4).

UNBEKANNTE JUGENDGEDICHTE VON CARL FRIEDRICH CRAMER.

In der Bibliothek meines Freundes Carl Claudius in Kopenhagen, des weit über die Grenzen seines Vaterlandes hinaus bekannten Sammlers historischer Musikinstrumente, fand ich eine Originalhandschrift unbekannter Jugendgedichte von Carl Friedrich Cramer: ein in dunkelroten Plüsch gebundenes kleines Oktavbuch, 73 Blätter, von holländischem Papier mit einem Wasserzeichen von J. Honig & Zoon. Die Schriftzüge sind dieselben wie auf den ebenfalls von Cramer beschriebenen Seiten 215 bis 235 des Göttinger Hainbundbuches A 1, dessen Einsicht mir der jetzige Besitzer, Herr Professor Dr Klussmann in Hamburg, bereitwilligst gestattete.

Die Handschrift enthält:

(Titelblatt) *Poesien von C. F. Cramer.*

(1) *An Doris.* 35 Zeilen.

(2) *Ode.* 3 vierzeilige Strophen.

(3) *Ode. Nach der 3ten des IV Buches des Horazius.* 16 Hexameter.

(4) *Ode, an einen Freund.* 34 Zeilen im ersten archilochischen Versmass.

(5) *Ode bey dem Tode Friedrichs des fünften.* 9 Strophen in demselben asklepiadeischen Versmass wie **21.**

(6) *Ode. Tialf und Skrymner.* S. unten.

(7) *Ode. An Daphnen.* 7 vierzeilige Strophen.

(8) *Ode.* 5 vierzeilige Strophen.

(9) *An den Bach.* 11 Distichen.

(10) *Ode. An Doris.* 6 vierzeilige Strophen.

(11) *Ode. An einen Freund.* 8 vierzeilige Strophen.

(**12**) und (**13**): Petrarcaoden, mitgeteilt im vorigen Bande dieser Zeitschrift, S. 192 ff. und S. 374 ff.

(Titelblatt) *Poesien von C. F. Cramer. Zweyte Abtheilung.*

(**14**) *Den* 7 *Nov.* 1770. *Ode an Lucinden bey ihrer Abreiſe.* 19 vierzeilige Strophen.

(**15**) *Den* 20 *Januar* 1770. *Ode. Youngs Klagen über den Tod ſeiner Lucia.* 6 fünfzeilige Strophen.

(**16**) *Den* 14 *Januar* 1770. *Ode.* Dänisch. 5 vierzeilige Strophen.

(**17**) *Ode. Til Daphne.* Dänisch. 5 sechszeilige Strophen.

(**18**) *Sympathie. In dythyrambiſchen Sylbenmaaße.* 215 Zeilen.

(**19**) *Ode an die Weisheit.* 5 vierzeilige Strophen.

(**20**) *Ode.* 9 vierzeilige Strophen.

(**21**) *Ode, an einen Freund.* S. unten.

(**22**) *Den* 18 *Nov.* 1770. *Ode auf den Mangle Berg an Eliſen.* 14 Strophen in demselben asklepiadeischen Versmass wie **12** und **13**.

(**23**) *An den Mond.* 6 achtzeilige Strophen.

(**24**) *An die kleine Themire.* 6 fünfzeilige Strophen.

(**25**) *Ode. An eine Freundinn über Youngs Nachtgedanken.* Vierzeilige Strophen; nur 7 Verse erhalten, weil am Ende der Handschrift einige Blätter fehlen.

Sämtliche Gedichte sind reimlos, zwanzig davon werden ja als 'Oden' bezeichnet. Sklavische Anlehnung an Klopstock in Form und Inhalt kennzeichnet die meisten dieser Versuche des Dichterjünglings, der noch ganz in der Nachahmung befangen ist. Der landschaftliche Hintergrund in einigen von diesen Gedichten weist auf die kopenhagener Jugendzeit Cramers und auf Sandholm, das Landgut seines Vaters bei Kopenhagen, den Schauplatz des Skaldengedichts von Gerstenberg. Die beiden dänischen Oden sind in flüssigen Versen geschrieben und bekunden die völlige Beherrschung dieser Sprache. Die Einreihung der vier aus dem Jahre 1770 datierten Gedichte zeigt, dass die Anordnung der Sammlung nicht chronologisch ist. Den Gedichten sind vier Sinnsprüche und zahlreiche Anmerkungen beigegeben, in denen der junge Cramer seine Belesenheit und Gelehrsamkeit zeigt; in einer von diesen wird Klopstock 'der grösste Dichter aller Zeiten' genannt.

Neben den früher mitgeteilten Petrarcaoden dürften die Eislaufoden **6** und **21** ein gewisses Interesse verdienen; sie mögen deshalb mit Cramers Anmerkungen hier Platz finden.

(6) Ode.

Tialf und Skrymner[1].

Tialf.

Hier, Rieſe, ſteh' ich beſchuht, mit Flügeln des Winds
Komm ſtreite mit mir in dem Lauf
Hier auf dem blinkenden Eis, ich fordre dich laut
Zum Tanze des Eisſchuhes auf.

Schon fleugt mein eilender Fuß, in gleitendem Schwung
Die eben glänzende Bahn
Nicht hier o Rieſe wie dort, beym moſigten Fels
Beſiegſt du des Tanzenden Fuß.

Auf, auf, und zögre nicht mehr! Beflügle dich bald
Zum Flug auf dem Rücken des Stroms
Siehſt du am Ende der Bahn beym fernen Gebüſch
Die ſchimmernde Pforte von Eis!

Den hellen Spiegel der Sonn' im farbigtem Hang
Wie er mit blendendem Licht
Den Thau der Blumen beſtrahlt[2] die ſez ich zum Ziel
Des gleitenden Laufs auf dem Eis.

Skrymner.

Ha Jüngling! meineſt du daß im ſchwindelndem Tanz
Der Rücken des Stromes mich trägt?
Die Schweere meines Gewichts zerbräche das Eis
Begönn' des Eisſtahles Lauf.

Doch wenn im Fluge des Winds zu laufen du wähnſt
So komme mein Sohn von dem Fels
Der dort in Wolken ſein Haupt verhüllet, herab!
Dann ſieg' in des Eisſtahles Lauf!

Tialf.

Er komm' er komme herab, vom Felſen herab
Ich ſtreite mit ihm um den Sieg
Und wenn er nicht wie der Nord die Bahn hinauf fliegt
So ſieget ſo ſieget er nicht.

Iſt das o Rieſe dein Sohn, am Ende der Bahn?
Ha! fürchterlich fürchterlich ſchnell
Schießt er vom Hange des Bergs, des Schneebergs herab
Aufs blinkende ſchwankende Eis.

O ſchneller eilender Lauf! Schon kömmt er mir gleich
Wie flieget, wie fliegt er dahin!
Schnell wie vom Bogen des Tyrs[3] ein ſchwirrender Pfeil
So gleitet er fort auf dem Eis.

Geſieget haſt du, geſiegt! Da wiegt er ſich ſchon
Am farbigten Hange von Eis!
So wie des Eisſtahles Gott beflügelt am Fuß
Kam er meinem Laufe zuvor.

[1] Thor und Tialf zwey himmliſche Jünglinge, gingen auf die Erde, um ihre Leibesſtärke und Geſchicklichkeit zu verſuchen. Sie ſiegten überall, bis ſie zulezt zu einem Rieſen kamen der Scrymner hieß. Hier verlohren ſie in allem, auch ſo gar im Schritſchuh laufen. Wie es aber hernach heraus kam, ſo fand's ſich daß alle dieſe Sofen (?) Zaubereyen

und Verblendungen waren, und daß der Riese anstatt seines Sohnes ein Phantom unter der Gestalt desselben hatte laufen lassen. Geister sind freilich hurtiger als Menschen. Dieses ist eine Fabel der nordischen Mythologie wovon man den Auszug aus der Edda von Herrn Prof. Mallet nachsehen kan. Der Augenblick den ich zur Ode gewählt habe ist der wo Tialf den Skrymner auffodert, und von dem Phantome überwunden wird.

[2] Niemand als wer diese Schönheit der Natur selbst gesehen hat, oder sie von patriotischen Schweizern hat erzählen hören kann diese Stelle recht verstehen.—In der Schweiz giebt es Flüße die an dem Fuße der Alpen fließen; diese Alpen sind oft mit Schnee und Eis bedekt, und die Flüsse zugefroren. Auf der andern Seite des Fluß[es] blühen unterdessen Blumen, und zuweilen hängt von den Alpen ein Eiszapfe, von der Dike des größten Eichenbaumes, und der Gestalt einer Ehrenpforte herab. Vielleicht wird man aus dieser Beschreibung verstehen können was in der Ode 'die Pforte von Eis,' sey, 'die die Strahlen der Sonne bricht, und auf den Thau der Blumen zurükwirft die auf der andern Seite des Flußes stehen.'

[3] *Tyr*, war der Krigs Gott der alten Deutschen eben das was *Mars* bey den Lateinern und Griechen.

(21) Ode,

an einen Freund.

Reizend ist das Gefild, wenn eine Lenzes Nacht
(Da vor Cynthias Blick gänzlich der Strahl entflieht
Der den Traubenberg färbt, röthlich mit hellem Glanz
Nun in Wellen zurücke weicht,)
Vom Olympus herab, sich auf der Abendluft
Kühlen Fittigen senkt, und im umschattendem
Zartem Laube des Walds, säuselnd ein Zephyr weht
Und auf thauigten Fluren schwebt,
Wenn der Nachtigall Stimm sich mit des Baches Ton
Sanft vermischet und süß tönet der fühlenden
Der verwundeten Brust, dann sind die Gegenden
Für empfindende Herzen schön
Aber schöner sind sie, schöner und reizender
Wenn die Felder erstart, und auf den Flüssen nun
Die der eiserne Frost mit dem Cristall bezieht
Sich der schwebende Jüngling wiegt.
Freund! wir wandelten schon auf der bereiften Flur
Durch das raschelnde Laub, gingen mit leiserm Schritt
Mit der Ehrfurcht erfüllt, die man den Gräbern zollt
An dem heiligem Hügel hin.
Wo der Freund des Halvards durch die Entzückungen
Trunkner Freude beraucht, badend den jungen Leib
Froh in dem Sonnenglanz, schwebend in Harmonie
Von dem Dichter gesehen ward.
Jezo schimmerte fern, unserm entzücktem Aug
Schon im silbernen Glanz, blizend den Mondenschein
Von der Glätte zurück, jener berühmte See
Wo Blakullur sich badete.
Freund! was sahen wir da! Sag es der Nachwelt, Lied
Sage, Telyn, es laut.—Mit der Begeistrung Ton
Sings o *Braga*[1] durch mich! Denn auf der blanken See
Sahn wir mehr noch als *Gerstenberg.*
Ja! Denn baden sah er, wir aber sahn den Schwung
Den auf glänzender Bahn, tanzend die Göttin flog
Sags!...Nein! schweige, mein Lied! Schweige vom größeren
Denn du singst's nicht wie Gerstenberg

Das geringere ſang. Schweig! und entehre nicht
Durch den ſchwächern Accord und durch misklingenden
Ton, das hohe Geſicht das auf der blanken See
Du zu ſehen gewürdigt wardſt.

Dieſes ſprach ich und (mit niedergeſenktem Blik
Auf das helle Criſtall, ſtehend im heilgem Hayn
Grauer Eichen die izt waren vom Sturm beraubt
Ihrer Blätter,) da wünſcht' ich ſo:

'Möchteſt du doch hier ſeyn, der du ſo ſchnell als Thorr
'Da er von dem Phantom, täuſchend betrogen ward
'Das vom Schneeberg herab, Scrymner einſt ſendete
'Auf der ſchimmernden Ebne fleugſt!

'Und des Leyer wie Njords[2] ſilberne Telyn klingt
'Wenn nach ſeinem Accord hüpfend der Eisfels tanzt
'Wenn, der Steinkluft enttönt, folgſam der Eichenhayn
'Wie ein ſcherzendes Lamm ihm folgt,

'Wärſt! ach, wäreſt du hier! Würdiger ſängest du
'Trinkend ſilbernes Naß, aus dem ertönendem
'Quell des Braga[3] den Schwung, welchen mit glattem Stahl
'Auf dem Eiſe die Göttinn flog.

'Nur dem feinerem Aug ſichtbar, dem Bardenaug
'Der empfinden kann, Freund! Dann, o dann würd' uns hier
'Herthaſee[4], dieſe Fluth, und von dem Eis bereift
'Dieß Gefilde Vallhalla ſeyn.'

[1] *Braga* war bey den alten Deutſchen und Dänen der Gott der Dichtkunſt, eben das was bey den Griechen Apollo.
[2] *Njord*, der nordiſche Orpheus.
[3] Der Quell des Braga, war, was bey den Griechen, die Hippocrene.
[4] *Herthaſee* war ein See worin ſich die Göttinn Hertha zu baden pflegte. Zu dieſem Bade gelaſſen zu werden ward von den alten Druiden und Barden für den gröſten Grad von Glückſeeligkeit gehalten deſſen ein Sterblicher fähig war, ob er gleich, wie die Fabel unter ihnen lautete, gleich darauf ſterben mußte.

Die poetische Phraseologie des Eislaufs in **6** und **21** ist Klopstock entlehnt: 'Crystall, Schwung, Stahl, bereift, schweben, tanzen' u.s.w.; im Einzelnen sind seine Eislaufoden 'Braga' und 'Die Kunst Tialfs' nachgeahmt.

'Braga' (M.-P. I, 188) ist im Dezember 1766 gedichtet und zuerst 1771 in der zweiten Auflage des *Hypochondristen* und in der Hamburger Ausgabe der *Oden* gedruckt worden. **6** ist Ausführung von 'Braga' 58 ff.:

...Tialf, dem nie einer in dem Laufe voran,
Wie des Zaubernden beseeltes Phantom,
Tönte! Da röthete der Zorn Tialf!

'Phantom' (*Hyp.* und *Oden*) sagt auch Cramer: **6**, Anmerkung[1], und **21**. 46. Die Bewegung des Phantoms schildern in wörtlicher Übereinstimmung **6**. 31 und **21**. 47. In **21**. 30 und 31 bildet Cramer die Versanfänge von 'Braga' 54 und 30 nach. Vers 54 beginnt im *Hypochondristen* 'Tön's, Mundstringa, laut!', in den *Oden* 'Tön' es,

Telyn, laut!'; Vers 30 im *Hypochondristen* 'Sing es,' in den *Oden* 'Sing's, o.' Beidesmal folgt Cramer der Lesart der *Oden*.

'Die Kunst Tialfs' (M.-P. 1, 215) ist wahrscheinlich im Dezember 1767 entstanden und erschien ebenfalls erst 1771 im Druck, nämlich in der zweiten Auflage des *Hypochondristen*, in den Darmstädter *Oden und Elegien* und in den Hamburger *Oden*. In der Hamburger Ausgabe ist die Ode um mehrere Strophen vermehrt. Erst in diesen Zusatzstrophen finden wir die Verse 73 ff.:

> Hier die hundertfarbige Pforte vorbey, dem siegenden Winter
> Auf der Gletscher Höh wie Bogen der Triumphe gebaut,
> Dort den Klee des Thals vorbey,

Verse, die Cramer in **6**. 12 ff. nachahmt und in seiner Anmerkung[2] gewissermassen mitkommentiert. Auch zu **6**. 27 kann 'Die Kunst Tialfs' 97 f. nur in der Lesart der *Oden* angezogen werden:

> Und tanzten fort, bald wie auf Flügeln des Nords
> Den Strom hinunter gestürmt!

Gerstenberg hatte Blakullur im Bade, Klopstock hatte Braga auf dem Eise besungen; aus diesen beiden Prämissen ergab sich die poetische Vision von **21**: Blakullur auf dem Eise. Ort, wie bei Gerstenberg und Klopstock: der See am Skaldenhain auf Sandholm; Zeit, wie in 'Braga': eine Mondscheinnacht.

In **21** parodiert Cramer Klopstocks Ode 'Der Zürchersee' (M.-P. 1, 83). Cramer kannte die Ode in zwei leicht von einander abweichenden Fassungen, der ältesten aus dem Entstehungsjahre 1750 und der jüngeren, die zum ersten Mal in den *Oden*, Hamburg 1771, erscheint, denn seine Parodie nimmt auf beide Fassungen Bezug. Es entsprechen sich die Verse:

'Der Zürchersee.'			**21.**
1—2		Schön ist...schöner	1, 12, 13;
49	(1750)	Reizend...	
61		Aber süsser ists noch, schöner und reizender	
66 ff.		...und mit gesenktem Blick, Auf die silberne(n) Welle(n), That mein Herze den frommen Wunsch:	41—44;
69	(1750)	Möchtet ihr auch hier seyn,	45,
	(1771)	Wäret ihr auch bey uns,	53;
74 ff.	(1750)	...wir nennten dann Jenen Schatten-Wald, Tempe, Diese Thäler, Elysium.	58—60. Aus der ältesten Fassung scheint 'dann,' aus der jüngeren 'uns' in Cramers Parodie übergegangen zu sein.
	(1771)	...Der Schattenwald Wandelt' uns sich in Tempe, Jenes Thal in Elysium!	

Cramer kannte also, als er **6** und **21** dichtete, gewisse Oden Klopstocks bereits in derjenigen Textgestalt, die Klopstock ihnen für die erste von ihm selbst besorgte Ausgabe seiner *Oden* gegeben hatte, die im Herbst 1771 bei Bode in Hamburg erschien. Etwa um dieselbe Zeit dürften **6** und **21** entstanden sein. Und bald nachher, ehe er im Frühjahr 1772 die Universität Göttingen bezog, dürfte Cramer die vorliegende Sammlung seiner Jugendgedichte niedergeschrieben haben. Eine ältere Schicht innerhalb dieser Sammlung lässt sich daran erkennen, dass Cramer den asklepiadeischen Vers statt des Pentameters gebraucht, wie in **7**, **8** und **9**, oder umgekehrt, wie in **12** und **13**, wo noch über ein Drittel der asklepiadeischen Verse durch Pentameter verdrängt werden. Demgegenüber zeigt **22**, gedichtet am 18. November 1770, Cramers zunehmende Sicherheit in der Verwendung des asklepiadeischen Verses. In den 28 asklepiadeischen Versen der Ode **22** hapert es nur noch dreimal: ein Vers hat ××́× statt ×́×× unmittelbar nach der Cäsur, und in zwei anderen ist das Schema der ersten Vershälfte auch auf die zweite übertragen, wodurch Pentameter von der freieren Art entstehen. Einen weiteren Fortschritt über **22** hinaus zeigt dann **5** und über **5** hinaus unsere Eislaufode **21**. Cramers asklepiadeische Verse sind zwar auch in **21** noch nicht ganz einwandfrei: Vers 21 erleidet eine Verschiebung der Hebung und Senkung vor der Cäsur, Vers 23 wird in seiner ersten Hälfte von dem daktylischen Schwung seiner Umgebung mitgerissen—beides an einer Stelle, wo der musikalische Rhythmus Gerstenbergscher Verse[1] in unsere Ode hineinklingt,—und im Vers 41 wird es als Härte empfunden, dass Parenthese und Cäsur nicht zusammenfallen. Aber es mischt sich doch kein einziger Pentameter mehr unter die 45 asklepiadeischen Verse, die das Metrum der Ode erheischt, so dass **21** auch von diesem Gesichtspunkt aus als eins der jüngeren Stücke der Sammlung erscheint.

JULIUS FREUND.

SHEFFIELD.

Gedicht eines Skalden, Erster Gesang, V. 9—15 (*DLD d. 18. u. 19. Jh.*, 30, S. 359):

bade ganz
Den neuen Leib in Sonnenglanz,...
Bin ganz Entzückung,...
Und walle trunken in der Fluth
Der hohen Harmonie!
Wo ruht
Mein schwebender Geist...?

'THE ATHENIAN VIRTUOSI' AND 'THE ATHENIAN SOCIETY.'

If any special apology is necessary for the treatment of two obscure institutions of essentially unrelated history and aims in a single paper, it is found in the fact that the obscurity surrounding both has led in the past to confusion, a confusion that is still continued, for example, in the 'Academies' section of the catalogue of the British Museum. There is plainly a purpose, then, in gathering together some matters of record and speculation suggested by these two names, if only to emphasize the fact of their distinct applications. There is also special point in a historical inquiry into the meaning of the two names, since each has been regarded from time to time as standing for an actual literary club or organization of some kind in a period when organized literary study, either vocational or amateur, was probably quite outside the order of the day. Still another justification for our inquiry lies in the fact that the 'Athenian Virtuosi,' whose publications furnished an episode among Dryden's critical quarrels, has been the object of some degree of historical error, and that the 'Athenian Society,' an early English journalistic enterprise of no small merit, and at times of no little literary impressiveness, is in spite of its interesting associations still practically unknown save by name.

The causes of the frequent confusion of these two so-called societies may be traced in all probability to the lack of historical facts pertaining to each; but this confusion may have been increased by some coincidental similarities of name in the publications relating to their separate histories. This can be illustrated specifically without anticipating too many of the points in the history of the two assumed organizations. Richard Leigh's *Censure of the Rota*, for example, published in 1673, purports to record the debate at a meeting of the Athenian Virtuosi 'in the Coffe-Academy instituted by Apollo for the advancement of Gazette Philosophy, Mercury's Diurnals &c.' Here we are by pure

accident reminded that the Athenian Society in 1691 met in the Apollo Coffee-House, and published the *Athenian Gazette*, afterwards called the *Athenian Mercury*. In addition to this, the dedicatory preface to the *History of the Athenian Society*, 1691, is signed by the initials R. L., ostensibly those of the author. These are, of course, the initials of Richard Leigh, whom Anthony à Wood names as the author of the *Censure of the Rota*; but here again we have a pure coincidence, for the author of the *History* was practically without doubt Charles Gildon, and the initials are not, then, those of the author.

My remarks have assumed a doubt as to the actual existence of the two societies, but for the present, for the sake of verbal economy, I shall use the two names simply as names, whatever they may stand for, whether they represented societies or not.

The tangible facts which show that the two societies were unquestionably distinct and unrelated can be indicated very briefly. John Dunton is admitted upon his own evidence and that of Gildon to have founded the Athenian Society in 1691. All the publications of or referring to the Athenian Virtuosi are of the year 1673. Dunton makes no reference to the Athenian Virtuosi, nor is he mentioned in publications relating to them. There is no possible connection between the historical data relating to the two societies. Finally, Dunton tells us that he was born in 1659; he would therefore have been fourteen years old at the time of the presumed existence of the Athenian Virtuosi, a society sitting in judgment upon a play of Dryden's. The separate identities of the two societies are, therefore, beyond question.

The Athenian Virtuosi.

There are four publications directly pertaining to the Athenian Virtuosi, all of them issued in 1673. The first of these is a critical pamphlet which Anthony à Wood ascribes to Richard Leigh[1], *The Censure of the Rota on Mr Dryden's Conquest of Granada*[2]. The work was followed immediately by another pamphlet attack upon Dryden in the guise of a defence of the poet against the *Censure of the Rota* itself —*The Friendly Vindication of Mr Dryden*[3]. Dryden in his reply to these two pamphlets aptly alludes to their authors as 'Fastidious Brisk

[1] *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. Philip Bliss, 5 vols., 1813—20, vol. IV, col. 533.

[2] [Richard Leigh], *The Censure of the Rota on Mr Driden's Conquest of Granada*, Oxford, 1673.

[3] *The friendly vindication of Mr Dryden from the Censure of the Rota by his cabal of wits*, Cambridge, 1673.

of Oxford,' and 'Fungoso in the play, who follows the fashion at a distance'[1], indicating clearly the authors of the first and second publications respectively. In spite of the fact that Wood ascribes the first work definitely to Leigh, Malone tentatively assigns the appellation 'Fastidious Brisk of Oxford' to Martin Clifford, Master of the Charterhouse, and one of the collaborators in the *Rehearsal*, though Clifford was from Cambridge, and Leigh from Oxford[2]. The phrase, however, may clearly refer to the place of publication, since it is scarcely possible to assume that Dryden must have known the author of the pamphlet. Malone's assumption that Clifford was the author of any one of the *Rota* pamphlets, or connected directly with the *Rota* controversy, is probably occasioned by the misreading of a remark of Gerard Langbaine's. In applying to Dryden's own work some of his criticisms of earlier playwrights, Langbaine concludes: 'Mr Dryden having already been arraign'd before the Wits upon the Evidence of the Rota, and found Guilty by Mr Clifford, the Foreman of the Jury, I shall suppress my further Evidence, till I am serv'd with a Subpoena by him to appear before that Court, or have an Action clapp'd upon me by his Proctor, as guilty of a Scandalum Archi-Poetae, and then I shall readily give in my Depositions'[3]. It will be seen that in this passage there is no implication that Clifford was the author of the *Censure of the Rota*, for looking carefully into the value of Langbaine's figure, we see that Clifford is represented as delivering a verdict *based upon* 'the evidence of the Rota.' This seems to relieve him explicitly of the authorship of the book or of any connection with it. In Johnson's life of Dryden[4], however, we find a paragraph or two which conveys a rational explanation of Langbaine's allusion (though without specific reference to Langbaine's remark). Johnson refers to Clifford's strictures on the play as conveyed in the four probably contemporary letters to Dryden—two of which he quotes in part—which were eventually printed some years later in a pamphlet now very rarely met with[5]. This explanation complies wholly with the substance and figurative suggestion of Langbaine's criticism, and obviates the necessity of discrediting Wood's evidence and drawing Clifford into another quarrel

[1] John Dryden, *Works*...ed. Scott and Saintsbury, 18 vols., Edinburgh, 1882—93, IV, 376.

[2] John Dryden, *Critical and miscellaneous prose works...Collected with notes and...life ...by Edmond Malone*, 3 vols. in 4, London, 1800, vol. I, Pt. 2, pp. 377—8.

[3] Gerard Langbaine, *An Account of the English dramatic poets*...Oxford, 1691, 151.

[4] Samuel Johnson, *Works*...Oxford, 1825, vol. VII, pp. 259—60.

[5] Martin Clifford, *Notes on Mr Dryden's Poems, in four letters...to which are annexed some reflections upon the Hind and the Panther by another hand*, London, 1687.

with Dryden in which there is no reason to assume that he felt any immediate interest.

As to the *Censure of the Rota* itself, the work presents a fabric of particularist criticism upon the *Conquest of Granada*, dealing principally with questions of diction and of the consistency of the plan and treatment of the play with Dryden's own published criticism. It is, in fact, little more than an elaborate and pedantical piece of fault-finding. From its manner one is inclined to agree with Dryden in imputing its motives largely to personal malice.

The Friendly Vindication of Mr Dryden was, like the rest of the pamphlets in the controversy, issued anonymously. Its author is not known. The piece is only ostensibly, of course, a vindication of the dramatist, and all its force is borrowed from the *Censure*. The *Friendly Vindication* represents Dryden in the midst of his literary friends discussing the criticisms of the earlier pamphlet. In a peevishly injured tone he brings up the points upon which he has been assailed and talks them over with his companions, who, while flattering him into complacency, quietly pass among themselves insinuations as to the justice of the criticisms, with a good deal of private laughter at his expense. This tract ends provocatively: '*Finis* or not *finis*, as Mr Dryden pleaseth.' Dryden's brief rejoinder is found in the dedication to the *Assignation*, which is addressed to Sir Charles Sedley; in this he deals rather overseriously with the personal nature of the attack upon him, though his position is on the whole dignified[1]. This is Dryden's only allusion to the entire controversy.

Malone assumes, and his assumption has not been questioned by Sir Walter Scott and Mr Saintsbury, that Dryden's reply was addressed not only to the authors of the *Censure of the Rota* and the *Friendly Vindication*, but to the author of a third tract, *A Description of the Academy of the Athenian Virtuosi*[2]. All the editors of Dryden have regarded this work as a continuation of the attack begun by Leigh and followed up in the *Friendly Vindication*. It seems really open to question, however, whether the pamphlet is not a *bona-fide* defence of Dryden's position. The book is said by Scott to possess the same 'frothy, flippant style of raillery' as the *Censure* itself[3]; but while there is no question that this characterization might very well apply to the

[1] *Works*, ed. Scott and Saintsbury, vol. IV, pp. 369—77.

[2] *A Description of the Academy of the Athenian Virtuosi: with a discourse held there in vindication of Mr Dryden's Conquest of Granada; against the authour of the Censure of the Rota*, London, 1673.

[3] John Dryden, *Works*, ed. Scott and Saintsbury, vol. I, p. 133.

Friendly Vindication, a thoroughly careful reading and re-reading of the *Description of the Academy of the Athenian Virtuosi* has induced me to believe that the book, if not in fact a purposed defence of Dryden, is in any event sufficiently impartial to constitute an answer to the meticulous and frivolous personalities of the first two publications. As far as I can see, valid points of objection are raised and sustained in this pamphlet against the injustices of the *Censure* and the *Friendly Vindication*. The tone of the book in this respect is not at all that of the other two; this is indeed so strikingly the case that, far from resembling in style the *Censure* itself, it is sufficiently different from it to condemn for this reason alone Scott's surmise that the two may have been written by the same author[1]. Disagreement on these questions with so distinguished a group of scholars as have dealt with this point may seem less dangerous in view of the proverbial risks of the ironic form. The two-edged sword has smitten others than Defoe and Swift—and this work is certainly one of two things: either a frank vindication, or a bit of irony very badly overdone. My own opinion is, I repeat, that the pamphlet is just what its title declares it to be.

Of the three pamphlets mentioned above, the second two were of course subsequent to the first one, but the relative times of their appearance are unknown and unimportant. A fourth pamphlet appeared in the controversy, however, which was designed as a sincere defence of Dryden in answer to the *Friendly Vindication*. This last pamphlet, the authorship of which is assigned to Charles Blount[2], is *Mr Dreyden vindicated, in a reply to the Friendly Vindication*[3]. It is important simply as the closing publication of the controversy, a sincere work, but a feeble one. It purports to deal specifically with the actual criticisms of the *Friendly Vindication*, but offers little more than accusations of plagiarism on the part of the author of the *Friendly Vindication*. Its replies to the particular points of criticism in the first two pamphlets are very lame indeed.

As to the underlying problem, whether the Athenian Virtuosi represented an actual society of literary amateurs, there is no clear reason to differ from the beliefs reflected in the historical treatment of the subject among all of Dryden's biographers, that the Rota controversy was a quarrel simply of persons, and that the club name was

[1] John Dryden, *Works*, ed. Scott and Saintsbury, vol. I, p. 133.
[2] *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. V, p. 243.
[3] *Mr Dreyden vindicated, in a reply to the Friendly Vindication of Mr Dreyden, with reflections on the Rota*, London, 1673.

assumed merely as a veil for the attack, or for the ends of authority and prestige. The name 'Rota' is in all probability borrowed from James Harrington's 'coffee-club' of that title, of which Pepys was a member[1]. It is, of course, possible that the appropriated name may have covered the identities of actual foregatherers at a coffee-house; but the entire absence of collective variety in the method of attack seems to show clearly that the *Censure* itself scarcely represents the cursory judgments of a group of informal critics. Evidence of some finality lies in Wood's ascription of the *Censure* to an individual author, and in the reference of the title-page of the *Description of the Academy of the Athenian Virtuosi* to 'the authour of the *Censure of the Rota.*'

The Athenian Society.

In the Athenian Society we have a question of a different kind. This society was unquestionably organized, and was possibly chartered[2]. Its contact with life and affairs was extensive and, in great degree, commendable. It had as patron Sir William Temple; as contributor, Swift; as panegyrist, Defoe; and its historian was the unillustrious Charles Gildon. It earned also the possible honour of having its aims and methods burlesqued in a comedy by the City Poet, Elkanah Settle. The published work of the Athenian Society is well known as an early venture in journalism, and a competent reflection of contemporary life; the society contributed extensively to the popularization of science and philosophy in its time; and the final proof of its surviving interest is found in the fact that two abridged reprints of its most popular publication were issued in the nineteenth century. In the present case the question of the validity of the society's claim to the name of 'learned society' depends upon the meaning that they themselves attached to the name, or upon their good faith in attaching to the name whatever meaning they wished it to convey. Despite the relatively great importance of the organization and its valuable literary connections, all historical evidence regarding it seems to point to the conclusion that it was not, after all, a *bona-fide* society of amateur aims.

The materials for the history of this society are derived principally from two sources, *The History of the Athenian Society*, 1691, written

[1] *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*...Edited...by Henry B. Wheatley, 9 vols., London, 1893—9, vol. I, pp. 14 n., 20, 59.

[2] [Elkanah Settle], *The New Athenian Comedy, containing the politicks, oeconomicks, tacticks...of that most learned society*, London, 1693, 3.

without doubt by Charles Gildon[1], and John Dunton's *Life and Errors*, 1705[2].

Throughout the entire history of the society the name of Dunton is pre-eminent. Dunton tells us that the scheme of the society came to his mind when he was in grave perplexity as to a course of action to pursue in a case of personal trouble; he was greatly in need of advice, yet unwilling to submit the occasion of his trouble to the knowledge of those who might aid him. His difficulty brought to his mind the admirable plan of instituting as a commercial venture a publication which might have been of value to him in his uncertainty—a journal devoted to answering the questions of anonymous inquirers. This periodical he eventually established, enlisting in his service two capable assistants. The three writers assumed the name of 'The Athenian Society,' deriving it from the title which they had already agreed upon for their publication, *The Athenian Gazette*. The three original members of the society were, then, Dunton himself, the Rev. Samuel Wesley, father of the founder of the Methodist Church, and Dr Richard Sault, a Cambridge mathematician of high repute. Sault afterwards secured the occasional aid of Dr John Norris; but Norris refused the opportunity of becoming a regular member of the society[3].

The first number of the *Athenian Gazette* appeared March 17, 1690/1[4]. The society had advertised the scheme until sufficient popular interest was excited to provide material for a few numbers; and with the publication of the first copies success was assured. The second number of the *Gazette* changed the title to *Athenian Mercury*, but the title-pages to the whole volumes retained throughout the title *Athenian Gazette or Casuisticall Mercury*[5]. Nineteen volumes of the *Gazette* were completed, and it was announced that after the completion of the twentieth volume the subsequent volumes would be issued

[1] *The history of the Athenian Society for resolving all nice and curious questions. By a gentleman who got secret intelligence of their whole proceedings...*London [1691].

[2] *The life and errors of John Dunton, written by himself in solitude...Together with the lives and characters of a thousand persons now living in London*, London, 1705.

[3] Dunton's *Life and errors*, pp. 248—250.

[4] *The Athenian Gazette: or Casuisticall Mercury, resolving all the most nice and curious questions proposed by the ingenious*, 20 vols., London, 1691—7.

[5] There were thirty numbers of the *Gazette* to a volume, with a supplement to volume v consisting of answers to questions for which there was no room in the regular numbers. In this supplement, pages 1—6, appeared an ode and a letter from Jonathan Swift; the ode was one of the three poems that called forth Dryden's damning criticism of Swift's verse. Every fifth volume of the *Gazette*, it was announced, was to contain a supplement similar to that of the fifth volume; but no other supplements actually appeared. It was also intended that every fifth volume should have an alphabetical table of contents; but this, also, appeared only in vol. v. The single numbers of the *Gazette* were printed on both sides of a folio sheet, and paged successively throughout each volume.

quarterly, instead of in single sheet numbers. Only ten numbers of the twentieth volume were issued, however, the last appearing June 14th, 1697. As volume XX was not completed, it has, of course, no title-page. The reason for the sudden discontinuance of the *Gazette* is not wholly clear. It was read with eagerness to the last, and Dunton tells us many years later that the society had an enormous amount of unanswered queries, sufficient, indeed, to suggest to him the possibility of printing the answers to this material in an entirely new publication to extend to several volumes. Dunton himself suggests facts that probably explain at least in part the discontinuance of the publication. In the first place, he complains that the query plan was liberally borrowed from the very moment of its first appearance in the *Gazette*; and again, he tells us that the great number of the readers of the paper were not themselves subscribers, but used the copies that were readily obtained in the coffee-houses.

In the unpaged table of contents to volume V, under the index-word 'History,' is found the statement that a history of the Athenian Society should be found prefixed to the first volume. In the Burney copy of the *Gazette* in the British Museum this is the case, but many copies of the *Gazette* are found without the *History*, and the *History* itself is generally seen detached. This volume, which appeared anonymously, has its own title-page and pagination. The Epistle Dedicatory, addressed to the Athenian Society, is signed R. L.; this is followed by commendatory poems by Tate, Motteux, Richardson, Defoe, and an unknown hand. The *History* opens with a modest regret that so worthy a society should lack a Sprat for its historian. In the author's expansion upon the personnel and objects of the society, we are informed that its merits alone had induced the author to attempt its history, and that in seeking facts for the purpose he would have been utterly lost in his generous design because of the modesty of the members, were it not that a certain C. B., assumedly one of the members of the society, imparted the information that the writer wished, under the pledge that the informant's identity should be kept secret. At the end of the *History* is appended a commendatory letter from C. B. upon the completion of the *History*, together with a deprecatory letter over the initials of Richard Sault expressing regret that the author had chosen to make so much of his small merits. Disingenuous as most of this sounds, Sault's letter has a note of unquestioned sincerity; and with good reason, for the *History* is a panegyric sufficiently unblushing to rouse the modesty of any of the three members with whom it particularly

deals. The historical facts are few and tenuous. The society is referred to as a 'learned society,' and a comparison with the province of the Royal Society's labour is invited in the reference to Sprat's *History of the Royal Society*. In addition to the characters of the three original members and of Dr Norris, the *History of the Athenian Society* refers to eight other members, who, the historian says, 'afford so ample and so just a Theme of Praise, that nothing but my Ignorance of them, can hinder me from giving the World a more particular knowledg of them.'

This question of the number and identity of the other members of the society is a puzzling one. The author of the *History*, as we have seen, admits that he can throw no light upon it, and all sources of information on the subject that are offered by the society or its members are unsatisfactory, and, I believe, in large part intentionally deceiving. The existence of C. B., the writer's informant, would naturally lead us to assume that there was at least one other member whose separate identity might be established, but, as I shall point out more specifically later, Dunton himself was in all probability the one who communicated the facts of the society's history to Gildon, the author. So we are brought back to the three original members.

Dunton makes a number of conflicting statements in regard to the membership of the society. In the preface to the first volume of the *Gazette*, after referring to the difficulty of carrying on the query project with only one assistant (for we are told by Dunton that the first two *Gazettes* were written by himself and Sault unaided[1]) the writer continues: 'This inconvenience we have now taken care to remedy; and as we gave the Publick notice in some former Advertisements, engaged such Persons in the affair, that what would have been *impar onus* to any one or two, may now be dispatched with much more ease and accuracy.' Since, again, as I shall point out later, Dunton was in reality responsible for the statements of Gildon's *History of the Athenian Society*, we can take it for his own assertion that the society in 1691 numbered eleven members. In addition to this, testimony as to the number of members in the society is offered in the *Young Students Library*[2], which the society published in 1692, in the engraved frontispiece of which there were represented the members, twelve in number, seated before a table. A diaphanous curtain lowered before their faces, however, effectually baffles any attempt at identification of the majority

[1] *Life and Errors*, pp. 249—50.

[2] *The Young-Students-Library, containing, extracts and abridgments of the most valuable books printed in England, and in the forreign journals, from the year sixty-five, to this time* ...London, 1692.

of them. Dunton seems to be recognizable by his position in the centre of the group and by his beard, and Wesley by his clerical dress. The crude verses beneath the plate point out that the picture represents the membership of the society. In Dunton's *Life and Errors*, on the other hand, which was written, we may remember, eight years after the *Gazette* had ceased to exist, we find an absolute contradiction of all Dunton's previous statements and intimations. After referring to the accession of Wesley as the third member of the society, he says: 'With this new addition we found ourselves to be masters of the whole design, and thereupon we neither lessen'd nor increas'd our number[1].' But evidence as to the falsity of the society's pretensions on this point is found even during its actual existence. In the 'Preface to the Reader' of Elkanah Settle's *New Athenian Comedy*, published in 1693, Settle refers, with sublime indifference to grammatical structure, to the frontispiece to the *Young Students Library*: ''Tis true our generous Athenians have lately vouchsafed to give us some small lineaments of theirs in miniature...But there alas, they are pleased to wrap their faces in Mosaic Veils, very magisterially intimating that they are persons that daily converse so near with Divinity, that their shining faces are too dazling for humane View, and therefore no less kindly than modestly, thus like Bays his Morning pictur'd in a Cloud. I confess Mr Engraver has made a pretty Jolly Company of 'em: but there indeed the painter is a little too poetical; and our Athenians have a little strained a point: for when the true Muster Roll of that not overnumerous Society shall be examined, for the supply of that defect, you must consider that the Veil'd Faces are by way of Faggots to fill up the Troop: and in that fair Convention of divine Enthusiasts you must not take 'em all for the Boanerges of Wit, the Organs of Thunder, but like Guns in a Fireship, a Tire of painted wooden Tools to make up the Show.' For whatever reason, therefore, the society thought it advisable to pretend to fictitious numbers, there is no reason to doubt Dunton's final statement, made while the society was no longer prominently before the public, that at least during the publication of the *Gazette* there were three members only.

Eventually, however, the society did increase its numbers; but this was after the *Gazette* had ceased publication, and when Dunton himself was the sole surviving member. Dunton wished to revive the query plan again, making use in part of the material left over when the *Gazette* was abandoned. In the meantime Sault had died, Dr Norris

[1] *Life and Errors*, p. 256.

had written a sharp reply to the Athenians' comments upon his criticism of Locke's *Essay concerning Human Understanding*[1], and from many acerbitous allusions to Wesley, it is evident that Dunton had quarrelled with the last of his three original collaborators[2]. It was necessary, therefore, for Dunton to enlist an entirely new corps of workers. This he did, calling the revived society New Athens. In referring to the reorganized society he says: 'Our Triumvirate is not only supply'd, but the number increas'd by a new election of Nine Members, all masters in their several faculties, so that the World shall shortly hear from New Athens, in a supplementary way to the performances of the old[3].' The dedication to the Athenian Spy, 1709[4], also shows that the New Athenians were more numerous than their predecessors, adding a fact of incidental interest, that 'the most Pindarick lady,' in all probability Mrs Elizabeth Singer Rowe, had been asked, and had refused, to become one of the new number. Dunton's plan to produce a continuation of the *Gazette* took form in the publication of the *Athenian Oracle*[5]. This was in part a reprint and in part a continuation of the *Gazette* material. Its extracts from the *Gazette* were judicious and representative; so it is in reality more consistently entertaining than the *Gazette* itself.

It will have been seen in the last few paragraphs that the most noteworthy single fact in the history of the society is the pre-eminence of Dunton from beginning to end. In Settle's *New Athenian Comedy* he is represented as presiding at the meetings of the society. In all of his works in which he refers to the society, he alludes to himself as the organizer and conductor of the project. But his less guarded references reveal still more; for although he tried to establish a popular belief in the amateur and elective status of the society, we find him to have held a personal relation to it which must dismiss any doubt as to the true plan and motives of the organization. Gildon's *History* is plainly intended to convey the impression that the aims of the society were philanthropic and instructive, and Gildon himself asserts that he

[1] John Norris, *Christian Blessedness: or discourses upon the Beatitudes...To which are added, Reflections upon a late Essay concerning Human Understanding: with a reply to the remarks made upon them by the Athenian Society*, 2nd ed., London, 1692, pp. 45—65.

[2] *Life and Errors*, passim, and *Athenian Sport: or, two thousand paradoxes merrily argued...by a member of the Athenian Society* [John Dunton], London, 1707, passim.

[3] *Life and Errors*, pp. 261—2.

[4] *The Athenian Spy: discovering the secret letters which were sent to the Athenian Society by several ingenious ladies, relating to the management of their affections. Being a complete system of love cases...*2nd ed., London, 1709.

[5] *The Athenian Oracle: being an entire collection of all the valuable questions and answers in the old Athenian Mercuries. Intermixed with many cases...never before published....*4 vols., London, 1703—10. (Vol. 4 contains a reprint of Gildon's *History of the Athenian Society*. New editions of the *Oracle* were published in 1820 and 1892.)

undertook the *History* upon his own initiative and solely because of the merits of the society's project. Dunton, when he tells us that Gildon wrote the *History*, says simply that 'Mr Gildon thought it worth his while' to write the work[1]. But in recording his personal impression of Gildon he says: 'He [Gildon] was always very just in the Engagements where I had any concern, and his Performances were done, as well as the Designs would admit. He writ the History of the Athenian Society, which contain'd the just Merits of that Cause[2]'; this is apparently a clear implication that the writing of the *History* was an 'engagement' in which Dunton had some concern. Again, in writing the character of Defoe, Dunton says with a passing allusion to the hard necessity which kept Defoe at his hack-work—and which Dunton himself felt continually in the latter part of his career—'Mr Foe writ for me the Character of Dr Annesley and a Pindarick in Honour of the Athenian Society which was prefix'd to the History of it, and he might have ask'd me the Question before he had inserted either of 'em in the Collection of his Works, in Regard, he writes so bitterly against the same Injustice in others[3].' Again, although we find the Epistle Dedicatory to Gildon's *History* signed with the initials R. L., there is strong reason for the assumption that Dunton himself wrote this dedication, as he appropriates *verbatim* a long passage from it in his own dedication to *Athenianism*, 1710[4]. Furthermore, in the reprint of the *History* in the fourth volume of the *Athenian Oracle* Dunton edits the history liberally, and often significantly. This evidence seems, cumulatively, to establish the fact that the society's reticence toward's Gildon's undertaking was merely assumed—that, in fact, it was at Dunton's instance that Gildon wrote the *History*, for the purpose of advertising the society, and that Dunton regarded the work as his own literary property, to be used as he saw fit for the furtherance of his projects.

These facts and deductions seem to warrant the opinion that in a large part of the society's transactions Dunton alone stood as the responsible officer; and this conclusion is supported by a quantity of evidence from the same and similar sources. In the first place, shortly after the appearance of the *Gazette*, action was brought against the society, apparently by the proprietors of a journal of similar title. It

[1] *Life and Errors*, p. 258.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 241.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 239—40.
[4] *Athenianism: or the new projects of Mr John Dunton,...being six hundred distinct treatises...and is an entire collection of all his writings...*Vol. I,...London, 1710.

was evidently for this reason that the title *Athenian Gazette* was changed to *Athenian Mercury*. From Settle's reference to the matter we learn that the society secured at the same time some sort of governmental protection, probably incorporation, to warrant their continued use of the new title. In alluding to this transaction, Settle indicates that Dunton himself had paid the costs of it—thirty guineas[1]. This fact supports the probability that Dunton was not only the founder and leader of the society, but also its financial factor, a probability further emphasized by his constant allusion to the society as 'my project,' a phrase which was applied to all of his financial ventures. We infer, too, from Dunton's mention of the early Athenians that it was he personally who enlisted the services of Wesley and Sault after he had found himself unable to command the entire project single-handed[2]. Our surmises on this point are supported also by references to his connection with the New Athenians. In mentioning the publication of the *Oracle*, he tells us that he personally sold the publisher's rights to 'Mr Bell of Cornhill[3]'; and later, in the 'character' of Mr Bell, we see that Dunton regarded it as a personal grievance that Bell had in some way presumed upon his privileges as purchaser. Referring again to the *Oracle* project he says: 'If my Honored Mother (Madame Jane Nicholas) will be so kind, as to lend me Two Hundred Pound, to carry on this New-Oracle, I doubt not by Christmas next...to pay all I owe to the World[4].' These references establish with certainty Dunton's financial responsibility for the society; the final piece of evidence as to the extent of his connection with the society is found, however, in the Dedicatory Preface to *Athenianism*, published in 1710. Here, addressing the society, he congratulates himself on 'being Honour'd so far as to be chosen and continu'd a Member of your Society,' endeavouring here to sustain his old deception as to the elective nature of the society. But with his curiously thoughtless but characteristic inadvertency, in the same preface he proposes the publication of a weekly paper, the *Athenian News, or Dunton's Apollo, containing Twenty distinct Posts*, regarding which he says: 'If I find the Twenty Posts too many to gallop through Dunton's quill, I shall Press a TROOP of New Athenians, which I'll call—Number Twenty—and will oblige every one of these Listed Authors to affix his Name to his own Post[5].'

[1] *The New Athenian Comedy*, p. 3.
[2] *Life and Errors*, pp. 248—250.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 261—2.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 263.
[5] *Athenianism*, 1710, Dedicatory Preface.

This passage indicates Dunton's relation to the society to have been nothing less than absolute proprietorship.

To close the question, then, there can be little doubt as to the exact status of the Athenian Society; it was an organization varying in the number of its members according to the scope of the work which it had in hand, founded by Dunton and constantly referred to as one of his 'projects,' and apparently wholly under his rule as its promoter and the owner of its name and rights. Gildon's claim for it of the title 'learned society' is therefore seen to be wholly invalid, for the society was organized and conducted for purely commercial purposes, its members constantly changing according to the proprietor's personal judgments as to their efficiency as collaborators. The society was, in short, simply an editorial staff, working under the name of 'learned society' for the sake of its prestige.

Dismissing the justice of the claims to special interest implied in the titles 'Athenian Virtuosi' and 'Athenian Society' does not necessarily force us to a definite position on the question as to the existence of literary societies in this period. However, the fact that we can concede no importance in this respect to either of the groups with which we have dealt recalls the general belief—probably a correct one—that there was not, up to this time in England, a scholarly or amateur society concerned primarily with literature in its objective aspect. Such organizations and projects as the Areopagus, Parker's Society of Antiquaries, Bolton's Academy, Jeremy Taylor's Society of Friendship, the Royal Society Committee, may all have possessed functional or incidental literary interests; but it is probably a mistake to assume the existence of any institution of the type of our modern literary societies, for the reason that these owe their own existence to an essentially modern conception of literature as an object of scholarship—a conception which was scarcely defined before the middle of the eighteenth century.

HARRISON ROSS STEEVES.

NEW YORK.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

'Piers Plowman,' One or Five.

Prof. Manly put in the forefront of his case the *a priori* objection that 'lines 236—41 [of Passus V] are entirely out of harmony with [Sloth's] character,' since they treat of the restitution of ill-gotten gains. Dr Bradley spoke equally strongly of 'the incredible conclusion that the A-man forgot to mention one of the seven deadly sins, and represented Sloth as promising restitution of fraudulent gains'; though M. Jusserand's arguments on the first point, and Mr Chambers' on the second, seem now to have reconciled him to the possibility of accepting these six lines where we find them. But it seems hitherto to have escaped notice that the author of the so-called 'Wycliffite adaptation' of Archbishop Thoresby's catechism, who was very probably an actual contemporary of the A-man, gives us a case exactly in point. (*Lay Folk's Catechism*, E. E. T. S. No. 118, p. 93, l. 1352, punctuated to make the meaning plain.)

> The fyfte dedly synne ys Couetyse; þat is, a wrongwys ȝernynge
> to haue any maner good þat vs owyþ not;
> and þis is pryncipaly don on two wyses:
> On is, wrongfully to gete ony þyng....
> Anoþer is, wrongfully to holde:
> þat is, whan we wil not do to god almyȝty,
> ne to holy chirche, ne to oure euyn-cristyn,
> þat us owe to do be dette and be lawe,
> but only holde þat we haue to oure owne ese,
> not only we synne in Couetyse but also in slewþe;
> and not only he þat wrongfully getys,
> but also he þat wrongfully holdys, fallys in þat synne.

When we find this popular theologian so clearly explaining how 'he that wrongfully holds' comes under the sin of Sloth, why need we quarrel with the A-man for making Sloth say

> And ȝit I-chulle ȝelden aȝeyn. ȝif I so muche haue,
> Al that I wikkedliche won, seththe I wit hade?

It may be also worth while to indicate here the remarkable parallelism between *Lay Folk's Catechism*, p. 57, 877 ff. (cf. 82, 1225 ff.) and *Piers Plowman* A. VIII. 160 ff. on the subject of indulgences and good works; though this may not be pertinent to the question of authorship.

G. G. Coulton.

Cambridge.

Stage-arrangement in Peele's 'David and Bethsabe,' I. i.

At the beginning of Peele's *David and Bethsabe*, the speaker of the prologue '*draws a curtain and discovers* Bethsabe, *with her maid, bathing over a spring: she sings, and* David *sits above viewing her.*' The words of Bethsabe show that she is sitting in a sunproof grove or arbour. She is evidently on the lower stage, the spring being under the gallery in which David sits. Exponents of Elizabethan stage arrangements have tried somewhat unconvincingly to explain the relative positions of the lady and her royal lover. In 'A catalogue of fine and valuable books,' recently issued by Messrs Joseph Baer & Co. of Frankfort-on-Main, p. 213, there is an illustration which may help to throw light on the subject. This is Beham's engraved title-page of Hieronymo Braunschweig's *Thesaurus Pauperum*, as published at Frankfort in 1537. In the upper part of the picture is a window or balcony at which sits David strumming at his harp, though his thoughts seem to have strayed from his music. The title of the book fills a panel which forms the wall immediately below the balcony. One cannot see how this wall is supported, but in the recess beneath it is an ornamental fountain, about which grow shrubs and trees. Before the fountain, and apparently just beyond the shelter of the balcony, sits Bethsabe with her skirt drawn above her knees, her feet in a basin. Four maids attend upon her, one of whom washes her feet, while the others stand by with the appurtenances of the bath—pitcher and soap (?), towel, and comb (?); and 'David *sits above viewing her*'—not that he can see much of her face, but he seems interested in her fair fat legs. It may be objected that the lady is not bathing 'over' the fountain, and that, if she were, even her legs would not be visible to the monarch at his window. But the stage-direction may mean no more than that she is not having a bath *in* the spring. Of course the picture

is earlier than the Elizabethan age, and it is not English, but its intention is quite clear, and a sixteenth century audience might readily have accepted a similar conventional representation on the stage.

J. Le Gay Brereton.

Sydney.

Fielding's Choice of Signature for 'The Champion.'

One naturally asks, 'Why did Henry Fielding sign with a capital letter his essays in *The Champion* between November 1739 and June 1740? Why did he adopt the letters C and L, and only these? Why did he sign C up to and on March 1, 1740, and L on March 4 and in fifteen of his twenty-four later signed papers that concluded with the essay of June 12?'

These questions are perhaps partly answered by a paragraph in the C paper of March 1, the significance of which has not yet been pointed out. In this essay Fielding speaks at length of various devices that his bookseller has urged to give a 'name' or vogue to the periodical. He has proposed to declare that some of the papers are posthumous essays of Addison; that the writer was in Wales when Steele died; that he is lately come from Ireland;—or to throw in a hint about Lais's Wash (actually done in the issue of February 28); or to say that the writer lodged near Twickenham last summer; or to insinuate that Bolingbroke is author of the periodical, etc. Fielding says he 'scorned to impose false Colours on the World'; the papers should stand on their own merits; 'like some tender Parents, I had such a fondness for my Offspring, that I would not part with them to another even for their own Advantage';—and he concludes the essay with the paragraph to which I have referred: 'However, to pacify him, I was forced to condescend to agree, that in order to make my Paper appear like a *Spectator*, it should for the Future be adorned with a Capital Letter at the End, as well as a Motto at the Beginning.'

Each *Champion* essay has the motto at the beginning. Addison's signature in the *Spectator* was a capital letter out of the four C L I O. Up to and on March 1, the date of issue of the above paragraph, Fielding signed C; in the next paper (March 4) and in fifteen out of his twenty-four following papers up to and including June 12, he signed L. He never got farther, no other letters being used. If this paragraph is to be taken at all literally, we find in it explanation for

the fact that the essays in the first four issues of the *Champion* (those of November 15, 17, 20, 22) bear no signature, and that the signatures *are* employed in most of the issues thereafter—*i.e.* the original intention was to leave the essays unsigned. We may also see in this paragraph a desire of the writer to claim as his own the papers signed with letters, and a warning to his readers of the change impending from C to L: but perhaps this last is going a bit too far. It is of interest that the signature 'LILBOURNE,' ascribed to James Ralph, occurs first in the paper of April 10, after which date his earlier signature of two stars occurs only in the matter following the main essay of April 26. Perhaps the real reason for changing the signatures was a desire to afford variety, or for the moment to offer the impression of a variety of writers. The 'Advertisement' of the two-volume collected edition of 1741 carefully states that '*all the Papers distinguish'd with a C. or an L. are the Work of one Hand; those mark'd thus ** or sign'd* LILBOURNE, *of another,....*'

JOHN EDWIN WELLS.

BELOIT, WISCONSIN, U.S.A.

TWO UNPUBLISHED POEMS OF W. S. LANDOR.

1. *To Lady Blessington.*

(Sent from Italy in a letter to H. C. Robinson, March 23, 1835.)

So then at last the Emperor Franz
With spindle shanks hath joined Death's Dance!
Prythee, good Saint Nepomucene,
Push the pale wretch behind the screen!
For if your Master's son should know,
He'd kick the trembler down below!
Then would the devil rave and rant
That Hell has more than Hell can want
Of such exceedingly good men,
And fork him to you back agen.

2. *The Four Willies.*

(In a letter to H. C. Robinson in May, 1835.)

Never was braver prince than he
Whom Normandy's prime chivalry
Followed across the narrow sea.
Nor aught less brave his bright-hair'd son
Whom Tyrrel's arrow pierced upon
The forest glade; nor less, that plague
Of poor old Louis from the Hague,
Who in French perrukes and French blood
Nine inches (half his stature) stood.

But braver than them all, one fourth
That bears the name: he from the north
Brought Howick: what can that man fear
Who fears not ruin when appear
Such swaggerers, arm'd with staves and stones
And links and brands for crazy thrones.
'Steddy, boys, steddy!' once he roar'd
And knuckled hard the festive board;
Now he is safely on dry land
Can he no longer sit or stand?
Must children in another age,
When catechized on History's page,
Be sugar-plum'd who rightly lisp,
'Dame! he was surnamed *Will o' th' Whisp.*'

These two poems are to be found in the unpublished correspondence of H. C. Robinson. (Dr Williams's Library, London.)

J. M. Carré.

Paris.

'Paindemaine.'

In the *New English Dictionary* the word *payndemayn* is derived from 'panis dominicus,' but no further explanation is given. The etymology may be illustrated from Petronius. In the *Satiricon* § 30, Encolpius and his friends have just begged the steward not to punish a slave who has lost the steward's clothes at the baths. The grateful slave comes up to Encolpius and says 'Ad summum statim scietis cui dederitis beneficium. Vinum dominicum ministratoris gratia est.'

We find frequent allusions in Latin literature to the host drinking wine which was superior to that which he gave his guests, e.g. Martial, iv. 85:

Nos bibimus vitro, tu murra, Pontice. Quare?
Prodat perspicuus ne duo vina calix.

We know that the same principle was extended to bread. Juvenal, v. 70, says:

Sed tener et niveus mollique siligine factus
Servatur domino.

(See Mayor's note on the passage.) Already then in the Latin of Petronius 'panis dominicus' would probably mean 'the master's special bread' and therefore 'a bread of a peculiar whiteness': cp. Chaucer, 'Sir Thopas':

Whyt was his face as payndemayn,
His lippes rede as rose.

R. F. Patterson.

Cambridge.

Hispanic 'alteru' and 'altu.'

In English, *l* is distinctly *u*-like, as compared with the ordinary French or German *l*; and in some cases a former *l* has become *u*: *hawk* rimes with *balk, chalk, stalk, talk*. In Serbian, *o* regularly replaces final *l*: *bio* = Bohemian *byl* 'been.' Dissimilation of *l...l* to *u...l* is fairly common in Semitic, as Arabic *tautal* 'waver' for *taltal*[1].

These developments show us that the change of Latin *l* to *u* is not abnormal in itself: Spanish *otro* = French *autre* = Neapolitan *àvotrə* < *alteru*. At the same time, Spanish *otro* seems strange beside *alto* < *altu*. Menéndez Pidal puts the latter among the words that 'se denuncian como posteriores en fecha, ó como semicultas[2].' Such a theory is hardly reasonable, for an every-day word like *alto*; we must consider both *alto* and *otro* normal, and try to explain their difference in some other way.

Dissimilation may be of three kinds: alterative, as in *alma* < *anima*; dislocative, as in *derretir*[3] < *deterere*; eliminative, as in *arado* < *aratru*. The formation of *alma* shows that the sounds affected need not be just the same. The consonants *l* and *r* are enough alike to produce elimination, as in *temblar* for **tremblar*, Rumanian *altul* < *alteru 'llu, pleoapă* < **palbepa* < *palpebra*[4]. We can therefore assume that Spanish *alto* is normal, and that **autro* was developed by dissimilation. The same alterant action of *r* is seen in *otero* < *altariu*; here the difference of stress allowed the connection with *alto* to be broken.

I have shown in *Modern Philology*, VIII, 592, that the puzzling question of Spanish initial *y* and *j* can be solved by assuming for *ya* a dependence on stress, in accord with medial *ñ* and *nz*[5]; and by supposing that the rustic words *yugo* and *yunto* came from a dialect which kept *y* where Castilian developed *j*. Likewise we can assume that *salto* 'jump' is a town-word, while *soto* < *saltu* 'wood' represents a rustic dialect that had a stronger tendency to change *l* to *u*.

The Spanish development of *u* from *l* is found mainly before voiceless occlusives, or their derivatives. In *escoplo* for **escopro* < *scalpru*, or from **scalplu* formed by the influence of *scalpellu* on *scalpru*, dissimilation is visible, as in *otro*. The same reason probably explains *popar* < *palpare*, for the possible influence of the ending in changing a verb-stem

[1] Ružička, *Konsonantische Dissimilation in den semitischen Sprachen*, 42, Leipzig 1909.
[2] *Gramática histórica española*, § 9, Madrid 1905.
[3] *Revista lusitana*, XIII, 372.
[4] *Romanic Review*, I, 430.
[5] Menéndez Pidal, *Gramática histórica española*, § 47, Madrid 1905.

is proved by Italian *chiedere* < *quaerere*. The word *topo* is presumably rustic like *soto*.

Dental *n* has replaced velar *n* in *santo* < *sanctu* and *m* in *senda* < *semita*, so that we might expect the *l* of *calce* and *falce* to become palatalized (and later dental again). But this tendency towards an *i*-like sound was opposed to the general tendency of *l* to become *u*-like before a consonant. The latter was the stronger, and being exaggerated to balance the contrary palatal influence, it produced *coz* < **cauce*, *hoz* < **fauce*. The same development of *l* was repeated at a later date in *cauce* < *calice*, *sauce* < *salice*. If the variants *caz* and *saz* belong to the same dialect, they may be taken to show that *u*-like *l* was then becoming less general. In *alzar* the *l* has been protected by *alto*; moreover the sound that produced *ç* in *alçar* was probably always dental or alveolar, while the derivatives of *c* in *falce* and *salice* must have passed through palatal affricates similar to Swedish *tj* and Serbian *dj*.

When *l* followed *u*, the tendency to make the sound *u*-like yielded to the need of distinctness. This principle was so strong that it led to the other extreme, and *l* became *i*: *duz* < **doice* (= Galician *doce*) < *dulce*[1], *mucho* < **moito* (= Galician *moito*) < *multu*. A different evasion of the difficulty is seen in *surco* < *sulcu*, *urce* < *ulice*.

The derivation of *pujar* (= Portuguese *puxar*) from *pulsare* is considered improbable by Ford[2], on the ground that *falso* keeps *l*. Although this reasoning is accepted by Zauner[3], it is unsound. The *f* of *falso* makes the popular character of the word rather doubtful; but even if we assume a normal *l* in *falso*, it has nothing to do with the question of *pujar* coming from *pulsare*. Ford and Zauner overlook the fact that *l* before *t* has three derivatives in Spanish and Portuguese: *l*, *u* and *i*. Hence it is highly illogical to suppose that *ls* can have only one derivative. From the explanation of *mucho* given above, it is plain that *puxar* < **poisare* (with voiceless *s*) < *pulsare* is normal.

Portuguese generally agrees with Spanish in regard to the alteration of *l* to *u* or *i*. Catalan, on the other hand, not only keeps *l*, as *alt*, *altre*, *dols*, *molt*, but may even change *u* to *l*: *colze* < *cubitu*, *galta* < *gabata*, *malalt* < *male habitu*. This is especially remarkable, in view of the Catalan formation of *u* from other dentals: *veuréu* < *videre habetis*.

Edwin H. Tuttle.

New Haven, Conn.

[1] *Modern Philology*, VIII, 596.
[2] *Old Spanish Sibilants*, 121, Boston 1900.
[3] *Altspanisches Elementarbuch*, § 62, Heidelberg 1908.

REVIEWS.

The Old English Christian Epic. By GEORGE ARNOLD SMITHSON. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. I, No. 4.) 1910. 4to. 98 pp.

Mr Smithson states his method of attack with refreshing naïveté. He summarizes the historical and literary evidence of Latin scholarship among the English up to the end of the eighth century, and concludes 'when we examine the Latin prose of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* and the Latin verse of Alcuin's *De Pontificibus* we become convinced that men like Cædmon and Cynewulf must have been impressed profoundly by Latin literature.' This very incautious reasoning leads to a correspondingly unscientific method of procedure; Mr Smithson first formed his 'conviction,' then—in vain—sought evidence in its support: 'when I came to look for evidence to prove my conviction that the form of the Cynewulfian poems was profoundly influenced by that of the Latin, I was forced to admit that that conviction, although it is a natural one, is in most respects a mistaken one.' The dissertation has therefore taken the form of a commentary on the plot-technique of the four poems named, each section concluding with a comparison between them and *Beowulf*, and a summary account of possible Latin influence.

Mr Smithson's chief conclusions may be summarized: 'Of all the methods of development by far the most important is direct discourse' —formal in *Elene*, formal but with some tendency to become dramatic in *Juliana*, distinctly more dramatic and more natural in *Andreas*. The characteristics of the technique of the Christian epics are explicable as natural developments of those of the earlier native epic, without Latin influence. 'The Old English poems were practically uninfluenced by the Vergilian epics'; but 'we find that the Latin prose legends of the saints confirmed the author or authors of the *Juliana*, the *Elene*, and the *Andreas* in the natural tendency to unify the plots of these poems and in the characteristic Old English tendency to digress from the main line of action; and that the Latin hymns and dramatic colloquies of the early church confirmed the author or authors in the tendency to increase the lyric and dramatic elements in these poems.'

The selection of material seems arbitrary. *Guðlac* is excluded, without explanation; though its two parts offer particularly interesting

illustration of the various treatment to which a saint's legend might be subjected. The Exeter Book *Harrowing of Hell* and the Cædmonian *Crist and Satan* are ignored, while *Crist* is included. Worse, Mr Smithson treats *Crist* as a whole, because it shows 'unity of tone,' and writes of it throughout as being in its entirety the work of Cynewulf. 'Differences in style may be due to copyists,' he observes in a footnote; and beyond this he does not even discuss the matter. Patriotic feeling may have urged Mr Smithson to follow Cook, but his attitude suggests ignorance of the work of Trautmann, Binz, and Holthausen, and of the dissertations on the subject during the last ten years. The punishment fits the crime; Mr Smithson is compelled to waste much space on the differences in technique between *Crist* and the other poems treated. Repeatedly he acknowledges lyrical tendencies in *Crist*. Frank recognition that it is composite, and that each of the three parts is a hymn-cycle, not an epic fragment, would have saved much vain labour. The assumption that *Andreas* is quite certainly the work of Cynewulf is also unwise; though the probability is strong enough for Mr Smithson's purpose.

Mr Smithson surveys his material from the standpoint of what epic should be, without allowing enough for the purpose of the poems in question. Of course he admits the intrusion of didactic purpose; but he does not recognize that didactic purpose was the poet's dominant motive, and that artistic considerations would quite deliberately be subordinated. *Juliana*, *Elene* and *Andreas* are not art-epics on Christian subjects, but didactic tales in verse, borrowing much of epic technique. Hence the repeated digressions in all the poems; certainly blots artistically, but perfectly natural to the type. Even the shifting of interest in *Elene* from Constantine to Elene, and finally to Judas, causes only an apparent breach of unity. The hero throughout is the Christian champion, though his person changes. The transfer of interest is less violent than that from Satan to Adam in *Paradise Lost*. Much of the detailed criticism similarly suffers through persistent application of the ideal epic standard. Every poem, surely, must be judged in regard to its author's purpose. That purpose may be criticized, and its effect on the work must be noted; but it is unprofitable to estimate achievement without regard to what is attempted.

The points at which Mr Smithson's detailed comments need modification are too numerous to mention in a brief review. In general, he does not make enough allowance for the influence, on the one hand of traditional phrase and of traditional epic technique; on the other hand, of the nature of the material. In dealing with *Andreas*, he does not recognize the deliberate imitation of *Beowulf*, noted by Brandl. The best section of the book is that dealing with methods of plot development (v), especially the interesting and valuable account of the use of dialogue. Except for this, Mr Smithson offers no new material of importance; but his minute investigation confirms current views on the main characteristics of the plot technique of the poems in question, and adds some interesting

details. The lists of references to illustrative passages in the poems are full, and, to judge from a score taken at random, accurate. Indeed the whole work shows very patient labour, and it is unfortunate that the results are in some degree vitiated through Mr Smithson's narrowness of outlook.

A. R. Skemp.

Bristol.

Robert Herrick, A Biographical and Critical Study. By F. W. Moorman. London: John Lane. 1910. 8vo. xiv + 344 pp.

In this comely volume Professor Moorman has turned a tempting opportunity to excellent account. He has recognised that the work of biographers, editors, and essayists during the last fifty years has prepared the way for a comprehensive study of Herrick's life and writings. He has supplemented the labours of his predecessors by researches of his own, and the result is a volume which, in spite of some curious inaccuracies, hereafter noted, is throughout worthy of its delightful theme.

The book is divided into two approximately equal parts, 'The Life' and 'The Works.' Anyone who will take the trouble to compare the biographical chapters with the similar section of Grosart's 'Memorial Introduction' to his edition of Herrick (1876) will note at once the difference between them. Though Grosart's valuable pioneer work must always be gratefully remembered he gives us little more than the raw material of biography. Dr Moorman attempts in a series of descriptive chapters dealing with the poet's life at Hampton, Cambridge, London and Dean-Prior to re-create the man and his surroundings. It is a fascinating game to play, and it is here carried through with spirit and skill. There are, however, two criticisms that may be made on Dr Moorman's biographical method. Except in the case of the letter belonging to Canon Egerton Leigh (pp. 37—8) he does not make it sufficiently clear where he is contributing new material discovered by himself, and where he is building upon older bases. Some additional foot-notes would have been a help here. And when filling in the background of the poet's life he at times gives his fancy too free rein. Thus while it is right to remind us that the boy was brought up after his father's death at Hampton, and 'therefore, though city-born, was country-bred'; and while it is legitimate to suggest that 'he may have caught sight of the old queen as she rode over Kingston Bridge' to or from Hampton Court in 1599, it is mere trifling to add that he 'perhaps saw something of the characteristic incident recorded by Lord Semple of Beltrees, the Scottish ambassador on this occasion,' and to quote in full the account of the incident (pp. 16—7). Again in reference to the performance of *Ignoramus* before James I at Cambridge in March, 1615, Dr Moorman says 'as a fellow-commoner of the University, Herrick was entitled to

a seat at the back of the hall during the performance, and we may be sure that he did not fail to be present' (p. 47). The last statement goes too far, apart from the fact that *Ignoramus*, though written by a fellow of Clare Hall, was not acted there (as Dr Moorman thinks) but at Trinity where the king was staying.

Another inaccuracy of an entirely different and much more surprising kind is found later in a quotation from the poem *To Dean Burn*. In well-known words Herrick bids farewell to its 'watry' (or in the modernised spelling of Mr Pollard's edition, 'watery') 'incivility.' Dr Moorman transforms 'watry' into 'warty' (p. 94), and that this is not merely a misprint is proved by the repetition of the misquotation on p. 133. It is difficult to understand how such a grotesque textual error should have been twice perpetrated.

Apart from such blemishes the biographical chapters are well-written and illuminating. Dr Moorman shows conclusively that the 'mistress-poems' cannot all be assigned to the period before Herrick's ordination. But he seeks to save the poet's reputation by advocating the view that the mistresses, including Julia, are nothing more than 'a poetic fiction.' It is a matter incapable of proof, one way or the other, but it is almost incredible that Herrick should have written about sixty poems to one mistress, many of them on definitely marked occasions or conveying special behests, if she had been merely a *nominis umbra*. In any case it is a startling transition from the atmosphere of the amours, real or fictitious, sung of in the *Hesperides*, to the matter-of-fact insinuation of 'Mr Dell's man' in 1640 that Herrick was the father of Thomasin Parsons' child (p. 118). There is no evidence in support of the truth of the charge (if it may so be called), but the discovery of the state-paper[1] containing it, which proves that Herrick must have resided for some time in London while he was vicar of Dean-Prior, demonstrates how imperfect our knowledge of his life is, and how baffling is the problem of the poet's personality, even when so able a biographer as Dr Moorman has done his best to interpret it.

Thus the second part of the volume, 'The Works,' is inevitably the more satisfying. The writer here throws his net wide, and the first chapter contains a searching discussion of the lyric of the English Renaissance' in its different aspects of the popular song, the art-lyric of Italian origin, the 'metaphysical' lyric introduced by Donne, and the classical lyric of Jonson and his school. The relation of Herrick's own lyrical poems to these various types of verse is then fully examined, as also to Jonson's Greek and Roman models. There is nothing more scholarly and suggestive in the volume than the discussion of the Caroline singer's debt to Anacreon, Catullus and Horace respectively. I only wish that Dr Moorman had gone still further, and had illustrated the 'frequent reminiscences' in the *Hesperides* 'of both the tragedies and the prose work of Seneca, as well as of the historical writings of Tacitus.' One does not naturally think of Tacitus and Herrick together,

[1] Apparently Dr Moorman is the first biographer of Herrick to quote this paper, but he does not indicate its *provenance*.

and I, for one, would be grateful if Dr Moorman would set forth in detail in the columns of this *Review* or elsewhere the debt of the *Hesperides* to the *Annals* or the *Histories*. In connection with Seneca it must be added that in a later chapter there is an extraordinary blunder. John Heywood is spoken of (p. 278) as the Senecan translator instead of his son Jasper. This mistake is all the more unfortunate as the elder Heywood is being referred to not as a writer of plays but of epigrams. Otherwise the whole discussion of the English epigram before Herrick, and of his own contributions to this poetic type, is admirable, and does justice to a side of his achievement that is commonly overlooked. Indeed it is the greatest merit of Dr Moorman's book that he recognises so fully the width and amplitude of Herrick's art. Thus of the *Welcome to Sack* he truly and finely says, 'It is not the utterance of some reveller, staggering homewards at dawn from some Eastcheap tavern, but that of a myrtle-garlanded priest of Iacchus, son of Zeus and Demeter, chanting his pæan of praise in the solemn Eleusinian mysteries.' Or again of the odes and elegies as a whole he notes that their elaborated style gives them 'a certain massiveness, a resonance, and an august, imperial splendour which place them at a wide distance from the homely strains of his songs.'

Passages such as these reveal the author as one truly 'sealed of the tribe' of Robert Herrick. When his book goes, as it ought, into a second edition he will doubtless remove the incidental blemishes which at present interfere with the unalloyed enjoyment of a 'study' distinguished both by its scholarship and its critical insight.

Just as this notice was being written, another and still more elaborate study of Herrick was published by a French scholar, Dr Floris Delattre. His work had been virtually completed before Dr Moorman's appeared, though he makes some references to it in his notes. The English and the French volumes present interesting points of comparison and contrast, with which I hope to deal in a later number of this *Review* in a notice of Dr Delattre's book.

F. S. Boas.

London.

La Jeunesse de Shelley. Par A. Koszul. Paris: Bloud. 1910. 8vo. xxii + 439 pp.

M. Koszul does not set out to write of Shelley's external life. His aim is to enter into the successive states of his mind, and by this road to approach his poetry, the poetry being resonant in a peculiar degree of his personal concerns and full of secret allusion to them. This purpose involved, however, the re-examining and re-telling of the main matter of the biography. For in the period which the book covers—that is, up to the departure for Italy in 1818—the story of the poet's

art is more deeply implicated in his circumstances than in the years when he wrote his best. His theme (to give M. Koszul's argument) was the mystery and beauty of Nature and the potential divinity of Man; but in England he was too much plagued by his environment and too deeply immersed in his battles with it to grow into these truths in a kindly way and to become an artist. The early intellectualism, to which only persecution could have held him so long, was all counter to his natural bent. The spiritual barrenness of the first marriage was another check to his power. And when the poetic gift had been quickened by the union with Mary Godwin and by his recognition of the tragic insatiability in his nature, his wife's suicide and the public branding in the Court of Chancery threw him once more into the highly strung mood of the outcast. For this reason the poetry of 1817, though full of the new ability, is a tumultuous and in some ways crude poetry, a passionate self-confession in the guise of objective romance. To attain to great art he needed to get away from England to that 'Paradise of exiles' where a wonderful past was nearer to him than the present. Of this development we have before us a more intensive study than any hitherto published, the very kind of book for which there was room and need. The environments Shelley moved into, the impact on him of books and life, were matters which called, not only for an imaginative use of the knowledge to hand, but, even at this time of the day, for supplementary research. M. Koszul brings into account all the relevant publications—or almost all—up to the time of writing, and adds a mass of annotation from his own enquiries. And he handles his theme with a fine sympathy for both its moral and its literary content, with eager and copious observation, and with a practised pen. If, in his zeal to chart the ground clearly and fully, he is apt at times, one may think, to draw his contours too incautiously and to see too much, the faults are quite outweighed by a good deal else that commends itself as both new and true.

To touch on a few main subjects:—A long neglect of criticism is made good in the first chapter which points out the signs of the coming Shelley in the novels and poems written at Eton. But we know too little of the days in which so much of the poet's making was accomplished, and this book can tell us little more than its predecessors of the old philosopher, James Lind, who seeded his mind in the seeding time. The episode of Harriet Grove is another of the passages, so frequent in this history, where the evidence is loose or lacking and the historian construes by his own judgement. To Mr Clutton Brock, for instance, the letters to Hogg at Christmas, 1810, are only an odd mixture of metaphysical flightiness and calf love. M. Koszul supposes a real passion and a cardinal event. The letters, he argues, are tumultuous, and seem artificial only because of the striving to control the pain and see the disaster philosophically. In all their tumult he finds a recurring order of expression:—the pain first smoulders in abstract discussions, then fumes more hotly in vows against intolerance, then bursts into flame in a simple cry or plaint. And not only was this the first of

several affairs that brought home to Shelley the tyrannies of the world, but it hurried him into his marriage. He married the second Harriet to fend off the memory of the first; not through any sensuous attraction, which he was 'too agitated' to feel, but in the deliberate and even hesitant hope of curing his wound. M. Koszul can argue plausibly for this reading of the obscure text, but it is a venturesome one. Waiving any argument about the letters to Hogg, the serious view of the first love affair was utterly scouted by Peacock. If Shelley returned to Oxford in his second term fretting with despair, Hogg never remarked it. And in the letters of the four months before the marriage Harriet Grove is not mentioned above once or twice[1].

It may be true that the letters to Miss Hitchener become warmer and more personal in tone after the first visit to Ireland. But it seems a dubious conjecture that Shelley was already losing heart in his marriage and went a second time to Cwm Elan to get some help from its associations. Again, the account of Mrs Boinville and her circle and of the influence they exerted is surely overcoloured. Shelley was once or twice made welcome at Bracknell without his wife; Mrs Newton used to call Harriet 'the lady'; Mrs Boinville, when Shelley visited her after his seemingly aimless rush to Edinburgh at the end of 1813, writes that 'he is making a trial of homespun pleasures with us, and likes them so well that he is resolved to give up rambling and begin a course of them himself.' In all this M. Koszul spies danger. He suggests that these ladies—or perhaps only Cornelia Turner—were flirting with Shelley, and were at pains to get him away from Harriet. The whole *coterie* was a volatile medium—'un monde dont les acteurs aimaient s'étourdir au choc des controverses de salon, s'enivrer de reparties et de citations, et papillonner parfois autour du scabreux.' And so it will have been by Peacock's advice, who was on her side, that Harriet took Shelley off to Edinburgh to save him from this 'sensualisme de salon,' this 'société dangereuse et légère,' and to conjure back her happiness on sacred ground (p. 202). For all this view of the Bracknell circle M. Koszul has only the very slightest evidence, which he obtains by a laborious cumulation of trifles or of nothings. It seems probable that in regard to the weightier matters of morals these friends of Shelley were strict, as is apparent, for example, by the letter from Mrs Boinville to Hogg referred to on p. 194. But to dwell only on what seem to be weak points in the biography is to ignore its frequent quality of *justesse*. And one important conjecture will strike the reader with instant force. It has always seemed strange that the *Alastor* should follow so closely on the fruition of Shelley's love for Mary Godwin. M. Koszul, pointing to his relations with Claire Clairmont in 1815, surmises that here is the key of the mystery. Through that temptation the poet had become aware that the intractable desire in his nature must cling to him through life like a penal spirit.

[1] The letter to Charles Grove (Dowden I. 169) talks of her, as it was bound to do. Mr Ingpen, in his collected edition of the correspondence, supposes an emotional passage in the letter of April 26, 1811, to refer to her; but it is surely Elizabeth Shelley who is meant.

Throughout the period Shelley is represented as first taking the intellectualism of the Revolution and then getting rid of it. He did not succumb altogether for a while and then throw the trouble off with a strong revulsion, like Wordsworth; he contended with it hard and long, but contended always. M. Koszul brings out the frequent contradiction between the agnostic pamphlets and the intellectual humility and random gleams of faith in the private letters. The turn of the conflict comes with the passionate year 1814. In 1816, when Shelley visited Lausanne and spoke of Gibbon's cold soul, 'l'intellectualisme est bien mort; à sa place est instauré le culte des émotions intimes.' *Laon and Cythna* 'marque le triomphe définitif, conscient et consenti cette fois, de la préoccupation artistique sur toutes les autres.' But perhaps these truths are too incautiously expressed. It should have been made clear that the process in Shelley was to subordinate, and not to suppress, the sceptical faculty, and that the distinction of his work is in the concurrence of the two powers. A useful section of the book describes his early speculations in philosophy, drawn mainly from Godwin, Sir William Drummond, and finally Berkeley, when he was vacillating between a conception of the world as matter interfused with spirit and as spirit pure and simple. How hard it is to define his ultimate view is shown by the hesitancy of M. Koszul's language about it. He says (p. 162) that the Shelleyan pantheism is 'le germe vivant, non épanoui, non organisé, resté tout individuel et sentimental, d'une religion qui nait.' In another place he quarrels with the term Pantheism, and would prefer to call Shelley a mystic (p. 303):—

'S'il lui fallait définir sa position, choisir un système, il préférait toujours le rétranchement négatif de son titre de défi: athée. C'est qu'en effet, qu'il s'agisse d'un Dieu-Personne ou d'un Dieu-Nature, tout théisme implique à l'égard de Dieu la possibilité, le devoir même, d'un amour de forme humaine, d'un amour fixe, concentré, supérieur à tous les autres, mais de même nature—l'amour religieux. De cela, Shelley depuis longtemps se savait incapable.'

Or do we come with surprise on the well-known line in *The Boat on the Serchio* of 'Him who shaped us to His ends and not our own,' when we remember that Shelley's *anima mundi* is Love, and that it is often addressed in the language of prayer? The main line in the book as to Shelley's art is by way of the Nature poetry. His peculiar power in this respect is considered as showing itself first in *The Assassins* and rising thence through *Alastor* to a rare height in *Mont Blanc* and an assured level of improvement in *Laon and Cythna*. The Shelleyan landscape—'le mouvant mirage à la fois si précis et si invraisemblable, toute cette fantasmagorie éblouissante et fugace'—gains from step to step of this development both in precision of detail and in mystic virtue. Its artistic faults are expounded in a close scrutiny of *Alastor*. Here, it is contended, the poet has not yet mastered his magic of the pathetic fallacy, but uses it to dominate Nature, to make her a mirror of his own consciousness against truth. Aesthetic judgements are hard to dispute; there are plain inconsistencies in the poem; but good critics have taken

a quite different view as to its accuracy in single touches. For the rest the literary sections of the book will probably strike the reader as the best parts of it, admirable as a rule both for keen judgement and just expression. Such are especially the pages on the two modes of Shelley's prose, on the febrility of his poetic style and the consequent principles of textual criticism, on his personifications, on the classical element in his art, and the whole review of *Laon and Cythna*, with its indication of the poet's enlarging humanity. Among the unpublished matter in the appendices there is the full text of Shelley's translation of the Marseillaise, and also an interesting letter from Charles Clairmont, Claire Clairmont's brother, to Francis Place, giving a long and most unflattering description of Harriet Shelley. Finally, the book should have had an index, and it is worthy of better print and better paper.

A. M. D. Hughes.

Kiel.

David Garrick et ses amis français. Par F. A. Hedgcock. Paris: Hachette. 1911. 8vo. 283 pp.

When Johnson said of Garrick, '*οἱ φίλοι οὐ φίλος*—He had friends but no friend,' he spoke but a half truth. The negation is sufficiently disproved by the figure of Garrick's faithful and admirable wife; a book like Dr Hedgcock's helps to confirm the positive assertion. It may fairly be claimed for *David Garrick et ses amis français* that it fills a gap in our knowledge of a man of many friends: for the relations of Garrick with the pick of Parisian society at a very brilliant period have for one reason or another been neglected by his biographers. Davies and Murphy deal chiefly with his life behind the footlights; Mrs Clement Parsons (whose account of Garrick is somewhat perversely regarded by Dr Hedgcock as the best written of all), Mr Joseph Knight and Mr Percy Fitzgerald are so much occupied with his English doings that they have little space for his French affinities, nor for illustrations of the truth of the phrase which Gibbon picked up in the salons after Garrick's death, 'cet homme était fait pour vivre parmi nous.' It is true that Boaden's *Private Correspondence of David Garrick* contains over two hundred letters written to Garrick by his French admirers, but Boaden's folios are not very accessible and are not altogether satisfactory when found. There was room therefore for this new book, and the author may be congratulated on his performance. He has availed himself of all, or nearly all, the existing sources both in French and English. He does not appear to know Gaehde's *David Garrick als Shakespeare-Darsteller* (Berlin, 1904), nor Sir Theodore Martin's charming 'Quarterly' article (1868); but he has made good use of the Forster collection in the Victoria and Albert Museum, and has brought to light many interesting documents unpublished hitherto. The arrangement of the material is not at first sight convincing. The book is divided

into four chapters, of which the first is entitled *Biographie de Garrick*, etc. But it is far from being a complete biography and is concerned with the detail of the life only down to 1741 and Garrick's appearance as Richard III at Goodman's Fields, the subsequent events being relegated to a footnote of ten lines. It is only when we consider the title and the rest of the volume, which describes the first visit to Paris (ch. II), the grand tour (ch. III), and the French correspondence (ch. IV), that we see the reason for this sudden *stretto*. Dr Hedgcock is evidently following the good example of Sainte-Beuve in prefixing to the study of a special point a summary of his subject's *débuts*. With regard to the first visit to Paris, Mr Joseph Knight was constrained in 1894 to plead lack of information in excuse for silence. The episode is indeed an obscure one in Garrick's career, to which he refers once in a letter to his brother, and never again—a silence which effectually discredits the story of his presentation at Court. Some fresh light has been contributed by M. Trenck-Brentano (cp. *La Bastille des comédiens*, 1903) and Dr Hedgcock seems inclined to suggest that Garrick beat a hasty retreat when he found how near he had come to For l'Evêque for attempting to coax French dancers across the channel. But Paris had laid her spell upon him, and he was anxious to return thither, as Sterne did, even during the war. Hostile relations between the two countries did not disturb Garrick's private relations to his friends, *e.g.* C.-P. Patu and J.-G. Noverre, and an account of them bridges the interval till the Peace of Paris and Garrick's grand tour. This is well described by Dr Hedgcock, especially the two visits to Paris, where he was welcomed with enthusiasm and during six months made free of the 'royaume de la rue St Honoré' and the houses of d'Holbach and Helvétius. The anecdotist will find plenty of amusement in the description of Garrick *salonais*; for the student of literary history the most important feature is the actor's commerce with Diderot. Dr Hedgcock traces to the influence of Garrick the change wrought in Diderot's histrionic theory between 1750 and 1770 (or 1773, to be exact). In *Dorval et moi* the actor was told to play according to the impulse of the moment; in the *Paradoxe* he is bidden practise reflexion, imitation, memory. And Garrick was a living example of the truth of Diderot's maturer principles. He had 'the art of mimicking everything, and the same aptitude for every sort of character and part'; and how little he let sensibility cloud judgment is shewn by the 'yeux terribles' which he made at Morellet during the full passion of *Othello* when the Abbé, sitting in the orchestra, ventured to disobey orders and peep away from the stage to the book. But despite the enthusiasm which he awakened, despite Diderot's precepts and his own practice, Garrick had little effect upon the French actors of the better sort, who stuck to their traditional style, and a bad effect upon the mediocre, who caught his tricks but not his genius. He himself learnt much from France. He acted, by general consent, better after his tour than before it. 'It was remarked,' says Davies, 'that our Roscius had, by visiting foreign theatres greatly profited in his mode of representation...his action was become more easy

and unrestrained...his deportment was more graceful and his manner more elegant...he did not appear to be so solicitous for applause as to distrust his own feelings and lessen the pleasure of the audience.' Moreover he borrowed many hints for mounting and decoration from the Opéra and Opéra Comique. But though his immediate debt to France was greater than France's debt to him, his ultimate influence was profound. He was, as Dr Hedgcock says, a sort of link between the countries and a herald of the *entente*. And his association, nay, his identification with Shakespeare served unseen to prepare the way for the romantic dramatists, for whom Shakespeare was the 'poeta sovrano.'

It is usual nowadays to underrate the services which Garrick rendered to Shakespeare, and from this tendency Dr Hedgcock is not altogether free. Doubtless Garrick laid violent hands on the object of his worship, to whom he built a Greek temple and set up a statue by a French sculptor: he supplied new endings; he adapted the plays to suit the taste of the day and encouraged Ducis to do the same. But if he had not consulted that taste, he would probably not have given Shakespeare the vogue he did. And as Sir Theodore Martin points out, there are other and worse ways of outraging the poet besides those which Garrick used; and he at least read aright what he preserved:

> Best commentator on great Shakespeare's text,
> When Garrick acts, no passage seems perplext.

And how splendidly he stood up for Shakespeare against his detractors, Morellet, and Voltaire himself! It is difficult to understand how Dr Hedgcock can allege that Voltaire would never have been so impertinent as to call Shakespeare only a barbarian, in view of the language of the Preface to *Sémiramis* and of the *Letter to the Academy*. '*Hamlet*...est une pièce grossière et barbare.' 'Ce Shakespeare si sauvage, si bas, si effréné, et si absurde, avait des étincelles de génie.... Un Gille...un Saltimbanque qui a des saillies heureuses et qui fait des contorsions.' Morellet and Voltaire both deserved the strong words which Garrick levelled at them. 'French dog!' and 'O the damned fellow!'

Of Garrick's general capacity and personal character Dr Hedgcock writes fairly and generously. His gift of epigram is praised as it well deserves: his limitations as a dramatist are rightly measured; and there is nothing in these pages that will alter the good opinion which the world has formed of him who was 'a genius and a gentleman.'

Not the least important feature of the book is the appendix on Garrick's family, which disposes of the legend (sanctioned by the biographers and no doubt by Garrick himself) that he was of noble birth. Other appendixes contain the text of the new letters, nine of Garrick's and two of d'Holbach's (in excellent English), a list of the Shakespeare plays produced or acted by Garrick, a sample of his treatment of *Romeo and Juliet*, and a bibliography. An alphabetical index gives completeness to a very scholarly piece of work.

The book is well printed[1], but the paper is indifferent and the sewing nothing less than disgraceful.

H. F. Stewart.

Cambridge.

Thomas Hardy, Penseur et Artiste, étudié dans les romans de Wessex. Par F. A. Hedgcock. Paris: Hachette. 1911. 8vo. 508 pp.

This book is one of those which have been described as very profitable, particularly to the writers thereof. Dr Hedgcock has spared no pains, and must have had much pleasure, in compiling it. He has held long commerce with Mr Hardy in all his works. The range of his *Essai de critique*, as he modestly calls it, is wider than the title-page suggests, and includes, besides the novels, the *Wessex Poems* and *The Dynasts*. No side of the writer's genius has been neglected. The development of his thought is diligently traced, from its first beginnings down to the settled pessimism of his latest utterance, which is of course contrasted with the optimism of George Meredith. His affinities, natural and acquired, his resemblances and dissemblances, are noted, out of a full knowledge of English and French literature; his treatment of woman, of the Dorset peasant, of nature, receives its proper appreciation. Dr Hedgcock turns his author this way and that, indicates his personal characteristics as well as those of his personages, examines each of the novels, describes their style, and assigns to Mr Hardy his place—a very high one—among the artists and thinkers of the nineteenth century. Nothing, in fact, is left unsaid; and here is the reason why the book is probably not destined to enjoy a very wide circulation. For, as Dr Hedgcock himself quotes in a different connexion, 'Le secret d'ennuyer est celui de tout dire.' Some justification for the extreme length of the book is afforded by the fact that it introduces a new writer to a foreign audience, and the French reader will doubtless value the analyses and extracts, which are all very skilfully done. But even for him there is some danger lest instead of visiting the temple itself (an architectural metaphor is permissible where Mr Hardy is concerned) he weary himself by wandering in the peristyle.

The English reader will probably doubt whether any living writer in his tongue deserves 500 pages of critical study, feeling that only the great dead, and the greatest of them, can stand such a test. He will regret that Dr Hedgcock had not time to make his study shorter and compress the results of his examination into more reasonable compass. For instance, we might have been spared some of the discussion on Mr Hardy's philosophy; that philosophy, although profound, and profoundly interesting, is simple enough and apparently independent. There was hardly need to cast about for 'influences' such as Schopenhauer to account for it, though Dr Hedgcock certainly adduces some curious parallels and might have added others. Mr Hardy himself denies the

[1] Misprints occur on pp. 38, 61 and 62.

impeachment and Mr Gosse assures us in a letter which Dr Hedgcock loyally prints at the end of his volume, that the ideas underlying the Wessex novels have been present in Mr Hardy's mind from the first and are the outcome of personal temperament and observation. With regard to Mr Hardy's art, it is true that many of Dr Hedgcock's conclusions were anticipated by Mr Lionel Johnson nineteen years ago. But since 1894 there has appeared the crowning example of Mr Hardy's latest manner, as well as the poems which contain in essence the theory expressed in that manner. It is in the handling of this that the chief value and novelty of Dr Hedgcock's essay consists, at least for us on this side of the Channel. He remarks the diapason that begins in the *Poems* and continues to sound through *The Dynasts*, giving unity and coherence to Mr Hardy's *œuvre*, and the chapters which deal with this are important for all students of English literature.

Apart from the general criticism already adventured which only applies where the reader is familiar with previous attempts to appreciate Mr Hardy's work, there is no cause to quarrel with Dr Hedgcock's presentation of his case. There are however one or two *obiter dicta* which are open to challenge. For instance, the remark that Wordsworth was 'pour les choses inanimées un observateur assez superficiel,' provokes an obvious 'tu quoque' and a reference to Professor Raleigh's passage on Wordsworth and Nature.

The volume is adorned with two portraits of Mr Hardy, neither of them very sympathetic, and there is a satisfactory bibliography. The 'Ausstattung'—paper, print and sewing—is the same as that of Dr Hedgcock's *Garrick* published by the same firm.

H. F. Stewart.

Cambridge.

A History of English Versification. By Jakob Schipper. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910. 8vo. xx + 390 pp.

This book is an English version of the *Grundriss der englischen Metrik*, an abridgement of the author's well-known *Englische Metrik*, which has had considerable circulation in Germany. Dr Schipper says that the English text of the present volume is a close rendering of the German book, 'except in the first few chapters, which have been somewhat more fully worked out,' adding that some modern poets, who seemed to be unduly neglected in the German book, have now received a larger share of attention. The views of Dr Schipper are of course already known to scholars, but as this is the first appearance of his work in an English dress, it may be convenient to treat it in this notice as a new book.

It is hardly necessary to say that it is in some respects admirable. It has just those qualities of formal and systematic treatment which are most wanting in Professor Saintsbury's *History of English Prosody*,

while at the same time it lacks most of the merits which distinguish those very readable volumes. Professor Schipper and Professor Saintsbury are in a sense complementary to one another; the one has his eye always upon the rule, and the other on the exception. What the result might be if they could be brought to cooperate, it is better not to enquire. In another matter too each is weak where the other is strong. Dr Schipper is for the most part admirable upon the older periods, but perfunctory and superficial when dealing with anything later than the sixteenth century. Professor Saintsbury, on the other hand, improves as he goes on, and is at his best in treating of the poetry which comes nearest to his own time. Dr Schipper indeed almost totally omits the modern period from his calculations, except in the classification of stanza forms. This is perhaps the result of a wise discretion; but a book in which there is no real investigation, for example, of the blank verse of Milton, or of the couplet of Dryden and Pope, has no right to be called a History of English Versification. The first chapter, which deals with metrical principles, is fairly satisfactory, in spite of some vagaries. We have here a praiseworthy attempt to define the word 'accent,' and a valuable distinction between the logical, rhetorical and rhythmical accent, the latter of which properly belongs to poetry alone, and may often give to a word or syllable an amount of stress which it would not naturally have in prose. In dealing with word-accent Dr Schipper says:

> In the Teutonic languages, the root syllable, as the most important element of the word, and that which conveys the meaning, always bears the chief accent, the other syllables bearing accents which are subordinate to this chief accent (p. 7).

But English is far from being a purely Teutonic language in its vocabulary, and it should have been observed that this rule applies only in a very limited degree to the non-Teutonic elements. Words like 'accent,' 'syllable,' 'consonant,' 'specific,' 'emphasis,' 'illustrate,' do not in the least conform to it.

Dr Schipper's account in his second chapter of the Old English alliterative verse begins with a good statement of the controversy with regard to a two-beat or a four-beat form of hemistich, coming down from Lachmann, though (as we are reminded) not Lachmann but his followers applied the four-beat theory to the English hemistich. The author does justice to Percy's account of the matter in his essay 'On Alliterative Metre,' which was far in advance of his time[1]. Dr Schipper remarks:

> Had this essay of Percy's been known to Lachmann's followers, many of the forced attempts at reconciling the Old English verse with a scheme that involved a fixed number of syllables in the line would not have been made (p. 21).

The account given of the structure of Old English verse is very complete and elaborate—too much so indeed for a student's manual. The author has apparently aimed at compressing his statement into a

[1] *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, Series the Second.

short compass without any considerable omission of detail, and the result of such a proceeding, when applied to so complicated a subject, is of course to make the statement far more difficult. At least the more and the less essential portions of it should have been distinguished by difference of type. At present the student is confronted with such a mass of detail that he will be apt to give up altogether the attempt to comprehend the system. In some points too Dr Schipper is too absolute. In dealing with alliteration, for example, he says, 'Wherever a vowel seems to alliterate with an *h*, we are justified in assuming a corruption of the text.' This is a very doubtful statement even as regards *Beowulf*, in which the name 'Hunferð' (which there is no reason to suspect) regularly alliterates with vowels.

The third and fourth chapters of the First Book are by far the best part of the work. These deal with the development of the alliterative line in late Old English and early Middle English, and with the part which it plays, in its more conservative form, in the poetry of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. This subject is for the most part admirably treated. Dealing with the metre of Layamon the author powerfully opposes the theory of Trautmann and Einenkel, that it is an imitation of Otfrid, and points out that the development of Layamon's metre, which is observable in the course of his poem,

> is with much more probability to be explained by the continual occupation of the poet with the Norman-French original poem, and by the increasing influence which its short octosyllabic couplets must naturally have exercised upon his own rhythms, than by a supposed intention of the poet to write in 'primitive Germanic four-beat song-metre,' the very existence of which is hypothetical (p. 71).

With reference to *King Horn* Dr Schipper says with justice:

> The evidence of the metre of this poem, showing its affinity to the alliterative line and its historical origin from it, is so cogent, that it is unnecessary to discuss the theories of Prof. Trautmann and the late Dr Wissmann, both of whom, although from different points of view, agree in ascribing a four-beat rhythm to this metre (p. 82).

The fourth chapter gives an excellent historical account of the forms in which the native metre was conserved during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and of the influence which it had upon the poetry of that period; and the author ends his statement by an interesting series of quotations, going back chronologically from the nineteenth century to the seventh, to illustrate the fact that the primitive Germanic metre has had a continuous history in English poetry from the earliest times down to the present.

The clear distinction which the author draws between native and foreign elements in English metre and rhythm is one of his most valuable contributions to the subject, and his treatment of 'Foreign Metres' in Chapters VI—IX is fairly satisfactory so far as the M.E. period is concerned. But the references here to Modern English are often disquieting, and in too many instances the authorities quoted for Modern English are Wyatt and Surrey, who should not be taken as

authorities for anything except the transition period, especially where the question is one of word-accent. Surrey was more master of his craft than Wyatt, but even he is insecure; and if Dr Schipper had thoroughly studied his metrical system, he would probably have allowed that in the line,

Love that liveth and reigneth in my thought,

a rhythmical stress on the inflexional syllable of 'liveth' was intended by the writer, and not a suppression of anacrusis.

What is said about omission of thesis in the interior of the line (pp. 139—41) is far from satisfactory. The line

Ne leve no man to muchel to childe ne to wive,

is not an example of omission of thesis, but of the intermixture of alexandrine with septenary which is common in the *Poema Morale* and in other pieces of the kind. Both the lines quoted from Surrey are cases of inversion of accent in the second foot.

Again, the author's views on the so-called 'epic cæsura' (p. 145) are more than doubtful. For Chaucer he quotes

To Canterbury with ful devout corage[1],

and

What sholde he studie, and make hym selven wood?

both of which have been shewn by ten Brink to be beside the mark. Words like 'studie,' 'storie,' etc. are dissyllables, the 'i' being absorbed, and are regularly reduced by elision to monosyllables, and 'Canterbury' is treated by Chaucer as a trisyllable, cp. *Prol.* 16. Again, the quotations from Surrey given on p. 216 as examples of the epic cæsura in Modern English are quite inapplicable, e.g.

The nightingale with feathers new she sings,

or

The sote season that bud and bloom forthbrings.

Can Dr Schipper really suppose that the final *e* of words like 'nightingale' and 'sote' was usually pronounced as a metrical syllable in Surrey's verse[2]? Nor again will the Milton examples on p. 146 serve. The treatment of 'Temple' and 'Spirit' in the lines quoted is quite independent of the cæsura (cp. *Par. Lost*, i. 139, 402, etc.), and the other line quoted was written by Milton

Created hugest that swim th' Ocean stream.

[1] This line is quoted in at least four different places in illustration of Dr Schipper's theory. It is apt to rouse some suspicion about the theory when a single quotation has to be worked so hard.

[2] On p. 160 the author makes the amazing statement that the final *e* is treated in 'Modern English' poetry as in Modern High German: it may be either used as a thesis or be slurred over or become quite silent. This statement about final *e* used as a thesis seems to be founded upon some exceptional or doubtful passages of Wyatt and Surrey. The author admits that it is not so found even in Spenser.

The fact is that, so far as English verse is concerned, this phenomenon should be called the 'dramatic cæsura.' It is frequently used by Shakespeare and by other dramatists, but hardly in any other kind of verse.

In the portion of the book which deals with particular metres the treatment is very unequal. The septenary line, for example, is very sufficiently referred to its Latin and French models, and the metre of Robert of Gloucester and some of the Moralities is well explained by illustration of the M.E. practice of varying freely between septenaries and alexandrines in the same series, a practice which is connected further with the systematic combination of the two which Gascoigne called 'poulter's measure,' in a casual jest which has had great success in modern times. This kind of treatment, however, has less satisfactory results when applied to the metres which have their principal development in the Modern English period; and these after all are of greater importance for English poetry. The history of the rhyming heroic verse ends, practically, in the sixteenth century, so far as Dr Schipper is concerned. The seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are dismissed in a single page (p. 218), and Waller is not even mentioned. Room, however, is found for the remark, 'Initial truncation or the absence of an unaccented syllable internally is hardly to be found in the verse of Dryden and Pope,' surely a too cautiously qualified statement, and for the assertion that 'Pope, in his original poems, completely avoids triplets,' which is distinctly inaccurate. There are at least half a dozen examples in the *Essay on Criticism*, and several in the later work, *e.g. Moral Essays*, i. 155, *Epistle to Arbuthnot*, l. 323. Blank verse fares a little better; but the account of Shakespeare's metrical development is inadequate, and almost all the statements are taken at second hand. The treatment of Fletcher and Massinger is quite insufficient, and the statement that feminine endings are used by Fletcher 'in some plays even more often than masculine ones' suggests the character of the information upon which Dr Schipper relies. In plays which are attributed to Fletcher alone there are often twice as many feminine as masculine endings. Milton, whose blank verse, Dr Schipper tells us, 'is of greater importance than that of the minor dramatists,' is disposed of in less than two pages, and to the blank verse of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Thomson, Young, Cowper, Wordsworth, Shelley, Keats, Tennyson, Swinburne, just one page is assigned altogether.

The author's classification of stanza forms is more satisfactory and has a wider range, but the nomenclature is unnecessarily cumbrous and technical. 'Bipartite Unequal-membered Isometrical Stanzas' is one heading, and 'Bipartite Unequal-membered Anisometrical Stanzas' another, whence we proceed in due order to 'Tripartite Isometrical' and 'Tripartite Anisometrical,' etc. Moreover the treatment is almost purely formal. The varieties in external form of the Spenserian stanza, in the hands of Giles and Phineas Fletcher and Donne, for example, are noted, but nothing is said about the manner in which the original stanza itself is handled by various poets, or the important differences

between the Spenserian stanza of Byron or of Shelley and the first model.

There is a chapter on Spenser's *Epithalamium* stanza and its relation to other Ode-forms, and one on the Sonnet, which contains the statement that Milton 'paid no regard to the relationship of its single parts, or to the distribution of the contents through the quatrains and terzets' (p. 376). This is surely a very extraordinary remark. Milton claims a certain freedom, no doubt, but he is far from disregarding the relationship of the parts of the Sonnet. He wrote nineteen English sonnets, and eight of these have the *volta* at the regular place, at the end of the eighth line. Of the remainder three have the pause so as to break the eighth line, and five have it either in the middle or at the end of the ninth.

On the whole it may be said that Dr Schipper has given us a very useful account of the prosody of the Old and Middle English periods, especially the latter; but he would have been better advised, if in appealing to English readers he had confined himself to these. As a manual professing to deal with English prosody as a whole his book is obviously insufficient, and the fullness of its treatment of one portion of the subject only throws up into stronger relief his neglect of the rest.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

An Introduction to the Study of Literature. By William Henry Hudson. London: Harrap. 1910. 8vo. 432 pp.

It is not by any means an easy task which Mr Hudson has set himself in this work. It amounts to an attempt to set forth by way of an introduction to literature some of the essentials of literary work, and the task was one which required not only a wide range of knowledge and a discreet selection of material but also clear views and definite statements on a subject that is perhaps peculiarly elusive. Mr Hudson has however shown himself to be specially well qualified for such a piece of work, and the result is an eminently readable volume which we venture to think will appeal to a large class of student, to the more widely read as well as to others less well equipped.

The work is apparently written in the first instance for general readers and in their interest the writer turns his back on 'questions of abstract æsthetics' as well as 'details of a purely scholastic kind.' But this is a course which has merits of its own: it has in no way hindered a scholarly treatment. Within his self-imposed limits Mr Hudson has succeeded in giving a sound and comprehensive view of his subject, while at the same time infusing into his work interest of a practical kind.

The first two chapters are taken up with a discussion of literature in general and with a consideration of the most profitable methods of study, in the course of which it is shown that literary work must

be viewed in relation to its author, as well as in relation to its age, to past ages and other literatures. Then follows a chapter on the elements of poetry, embodying a treatment of its content, its technique and its relation to life. A study of prose fiction comes next and this involves an exposition of such elements as plot, characterisation and dialogue as well as its relation to life. The fifth chapter, perhaps the best, has for its subject the drama, while the concluding one, which is rather more discursive, deals with the functions and methods of literary criticism.

But no analysis is capable of conveying the real merits of the work, and what strikes one most is the sanity of the treatment, the way in which the writer has succeeded in anticipating questions on fundamental points which occur to most thinking readers but which are often either ignored or superficially treated in works of a more pretentious kind. Mr Hudson's treatment of such matters as poetic truth, the relations existing between poetry and metre, between the novel and the drama, and between the drama and stage conditions, furnishes examples of this. And moreover there is everywhere present a clearness and freshness of treatment which is partly due to the writer's lucid style, partly to the store of examples with which he illustrates his work. There is in fact a complete absence of pedantry, and of those technical terms which seem nowadays to threaten literary study. It is only occasionally that Mr Hudson resorts to unfamiliar terminology, as for instance in the phrase 'the proportion of dialogue to compact chronical' (p. 202). It is true that little if any new ground is opened up in the work: but at the same time, guidance of a most efficient and entertaining kind is given over territory already explored. An intimate acquaintance is shown with recent scholarship, though it may be doubted whether the rather unsympathetic reference to Coleridge as a critic (see p. 250 note), and the statement with regard to the function of the gravedigger's scene in *Hamlet* (p. 275) would meet with general acceptance. All the same, the work is full of good things happily presented: it will doubtless commend itself to teacher and student alike, by reason of its useful matter and its originality of treatment: and, it might be added, its value as a text-book will be found to be considerably increased by the careful index which appears at the end.

J. W. H. Atkins.

Aberystwyth.

Landmarks in French Literature. By G. L. Strachey. (Home University Library of Modern Knowledge.) London: Williams and Norgate. 8vo. 246 pp.

Mr Strachey has performed an extremely difficult task extraordinarily well. It was no easy matter to write in less than two hundred and fifty pages a sketch of French literature which should

convey to the reader the spirit of that literature in an eminently readable form. The qualifications which have enabled Mr Strachey to produce this result are a close sympathy with his subject, a sane and independent judgment, and a remarkable power of pregnant and graphic expression. Naturally he is not equally familiar with every period of French literature. But with the ages of Richelieu and Louis XIV and with the eighteenth century at its full tide he is thoroughly at home. These periods occupy rather more than three-fifths of his book, as compared with three volumes out of eight in the composite history of Petit de Julleville. Mr Strachey's neglect of the dull transitional periods sometimes betrays him into curious statements. Speaking of Villon's poems as typical of the later Middle Ages he says, 'Then all at once the grey gloom lifts, and we are among the colours, the sunshine, and the bursting vitality of the spring.' But as a matter of fact sixty years elapsed between Villon's last poem and the first in which Marot really found himself. 'The long reign of confused ideals and misguided efforts' did not 'come to an end for ever' with the *Lettres Provinciales*, or there would have been no need of Boileau's *Satires* and Molière's *Les Précieuses Ridicules*. A couple of pages is short measure for the transitional period from 1688 to 1721 which prepared the way for the eighteenth century.

Mr Strachey has dealt too in a summary fashion with the earlier centuries, including the sixteenth, but there is a good deal to be said for this. Writing for English readers who are not specialists nor even, probably, students, he has done well to pick out the names that are of general interest. If for Ronsard and Du Bellay he is inadequate, he is thoroughly good on Rabelais. Truly he says that 'the whole vast spirit of the Renaissance is gathered within the pages of his great book.' A more intimate acquaintance with Montaigne will probably lead him to reverse his judgment that he is not a great artist. It is quite true that his style lacks form, for he wrote before the technique of French prose had been worked out and perfected. But there are some great works of art—aye, some of the greatest—that transcend form, because they try to come as close as possible to life. Montaigne's aim was to make his language an exact expression of his thought, and he has succeeded to perfection. Is not this art? It is satisfactory, indeed, to find an Englishman insisting upon the importance of form, but does not Mr Strachey carry his devotion to form too far? As for instance, when he says that 'if all that great nation had ever done or thought were abolished from the world, except a single sentence of Voltaire's, the essence of their achievement would have survived.' Finally, a place for D'Aubigné and Regnier should have been found in this chapter.

From Corneille onwards Mr Strachey is at his very best. He is excellent both on Corneille, whose romantic spirit he rightly notes, and on Pascal, though a *caveat* must be entered against the statement that in his last years 'he sank into a torpor of superstition.' Mr Strachey does not quite understand the spirit and functions of the Academy.

Molière 'remained outside it,' not because the Academy was 'timid or out of date,' but because he was an actor, and therefore a social outcast. The only omission that is questionable in this chapter is that of Descartes, whose influence on French literature, though sometimes exaggerated, was a very real one.

The seventy pages which are devoted to the age of Louis XIV are among the best in the book. The general characterisation of the age and the treatment of individual writers are as sound as they are vivid. The services of Boileau are duly recognised, and nothing could be better than the handling of Molière and La Fontaine. 'Whatever tune he may be playing there is never a note too much,' is excellently said of the great fabulist. But it is to the fourth member of this remarkable quartette that Mr Strachey gives the most careful and the fullest treatment. Starting from the remark that Englishmen have always detested Racine he sets to work to remove this antipathy and to explain why France 'declares with one voice' (there is some exaggeration in this) 'that Racine is not only one of the greatest of dramatists, but also one of the greatest of poets.' He points out with perfect truth the defective methods of Elizabethan drama, and contrasts them with those of Racine. Racine's watchword, he says, was 'concentration' and the true importance of the unities 'lies simply in their being a powerful means towards concentration.' This has been said before by M. Lemaître, but it cannot be said too often. In trying to prove that Racine was a great poet (in the more limited sense of the term) Mr Strachey has set himself a more difficult task. For even French writers do not contend that his style is a highly poetical one. 'Souvent,' says M. Lemaître, 'il rase la prose, mais avec des ailes.' Mr Strachey gives four specimens of Racine's poetry, but it is significant that each consists of a single line, and that two of them are among the commonplaces of Racinian criticism. Mr Strachey would have been on firmer ground if he had recognised that Racine's style, like that of Sophocles apart from his choruses, is not imaginative, and therefore not highly poetical, but that this does not prevent him from being a great dramatist. 'But Racine...besides being a great poet is also a great psychologist.' With the latter half of this statement everyone will agree, and it is just because English readers are not as a rule interested in psychology that they fail to appreciate Racine. But there is another reason. 'The accidents of character,' finely says Mr Strachey of Racine's personages, 'are not shown us—only its essentials; the human spirit comes before us shorn of its particulars, naked and intense.' That is very true; we are told nothing about the outward appearance of Racine's characters, they appeal not so much to the imagination through the senses as to the intellect alone. But an Englishman's imagination is more nimble than his intellect, and it is only after many readings of Racine that one begins to realise that his characters are really alive. And, when all is said, it is as types rather than as individuals that they are so wonderful. Their speech and outward manners are those of the court of Louis XIV, but their inward truth is for all ages and all classes

of society—they are 'naked human souls.' Hermione might be the heroine of a modern *crime passionnel*; Agrippine might be any dowager who finds her dominion over her son and his estate slipping away from her; Néron any adolescent whose criminal impulses are only kept in check by his fears; Mithridate any elderly lover who is a prey to jealousy. Mr Strachey evidently does not agree with those critics who pronounce *Athalie* to be his finest work, but he might have pointed out that Racine, who, like every true artist, was always making experiments, has here made a new departure in the direction of spectacular effect.

Doing full justice to La Rochefoucauld and La Bruyère Mr Strachey is inadequate on Bossuet, as he is on Fénelon in the next chapter, and, strange to say, he omits Bourdaloue altogether. But Bourdaloue is as great a psychologist as any of his contemporaries; his style is a model of clarity and intellectual vigour; and of all preachers that ever lived he is perhaps the most effective as a moralist. It is also strange that Mme de Sévigné is dismissed with a single line. Saint-Simon's place is with the age of Louis XIV. He was born in 1675, he began to take notes for his *Memoirs* in 1694, but more than this he is emphatically a man of the seventeenth, and not of the eighteenth century. To adduce him as a proof that the eighteenth century was not without emotion is unfortunate. It is even more unfortunate to found an argument on the fact that 'he mentions his wife once.' As a matter of fact he mentions her hardly less than a hundred times. Mr Strachey writes picturesquely on Saint-Simon, but one wonders whether he has read him continuously, or whether he has merely made the tour of his portrait-gallery.

The chapter on the eighteenth century is written with knowledge, sympathy, and insight. The influence of the *salon* and the predominant cult of *esprit* are duly noted. *Le neveu de Rameau* is rightly singled out as Diderot's masterpiece, and the comparison between Diderot and Rabelais is a happy one. Nothing could be more sympathetic than the treatment of Rousseau. Mr Strachey justly lays stress on his originality, especially as compared with Voltaire and Diderot, and he makes the very true remark that he 'was the only man of his age who ever wanted to be alone.' Later in the book he says that Chateaubriand's landscapes are 'less convincing than Rousseau's.' He might have added that Rousseau's may be counted on the fingers of one or at most both hands. It is not easy to be just to Voltaire. Appreciation of him not only as a man but as a writer depends largely upon temperament. Mr Strachey happily points out the striking contrasts in his character, and he is on the whole merciful to his faults and eloquent on his virtues. His style 'is perfect,' he thinks, 'in all that he wrote,'—that is in prose. So it may be, but, except in his letters, it is somewhat of a spare diet. Mr Strachey recognises this himself, for he says 'that a reaction was bound to follow—and a salutary reaction.' The chapter concludes with a vivid and just characterisation of the ten years which elapsed between the deaths of Voltaire and Rousseau and the Revolution. Nothing can be happier than the reference to *Le Mariage de Figaro* and the 'remark that in the sentence, *Vous vous êtes donné la peine de naître*,' one can

hear the flash and snap of the guillotine. André Chénier, whom Mr Strachey rightly recognises as a classicist and not as a precursor of the Romantic Movement, should have come in this chapter, and Buffon, who greatly influenced him, should have had more than a mere reference.

When Mr Strachey comes to the nineteenth century his grasp of his subject perceptibly weakens. His explanation of the Romantic Movement is not altogether satisfactory. He omits all mention of Mme de Staël, whose influence on the movement was hardly less powerful than Chateaubriand's. In saying that Chateaubriand's prose 'retained most of the characteristics of the old tradition' he forgets that he restored the sense of artistic composition. He undervalues the work of Lamartine, a poet whom Englishmen so rarely understand or appreciate. The Romantic Movement was not merely the reintroduction of Rhetoric into literature, it was the reintroduction of the twin bases of poetry, imagination and emotion. As regards individual writers Mr Strachey's criticism of Balzac is particularly sane and just; while recognising his limitations, especially the badness of his style, he does full justice to his real greatness. Vigny and Musset are treated briefly, but with sympathy and insight, though it may be objected that Vigny's verse is hardly 'splendid,' and that Musset's powerful play of *Lorenzaccio* is as formless in construction as an ordinary Elizabethan drama. Mr Strachey says some hard things of *Hernani* and Hugo's plays in general. One must confess that they are not undeserved, but, nevertheless, there is a glamour about *Hernani* which has to be reckoned with. On Hugo's work Mr Strachey is extremely interesting, all the more so because he is evidently perplexed in his judgment. He finds it difficult to reconcile the splendour of Hugo's verse with his intellectual and moral second-rateness. For he sees that Hugo, though a wonderful virtuoso, is not merely a virtuoso; that he aspires to be and often is a great poet. The fact is that we are still too near to Victor Hugo to separate with any finality the dross from the gold, or to determine his rank in the hierarchy of poets.

Mr Strachey follows the French fashion in ignoring Dumas, an attitude which is rather absurd in an Englishman writing for Englishmen. At any rate he should have said something about his dramas, for Dumas was a born dramatist, and his plays have had a real influence on the French stage. Another omission which will surprise English readers is that of Mérimée. It is true that he does not stand so high as he did in the estimation of critics, but practitioners in the art of the short story still regard him as a master, and his letters are among the most delightful in the French language.

In omitting Mérimée altogether and in relegating Sainte-Beuve to the last chapter Mr Strachey has ignored the realistic element which from the very first existed in the Romantic Movement, and which was represented by the writers for the *Globe* and the frequenters of Delécluze's weekly gatherings. It is true that this element was for a time submerged by the triumphs of Victor Hugo. But in 1835 it

began to assert itself, and from 1850 realism became the dominant note of French literature. It was not the impartial, all-embracing realism of a Shakespeare or a Rembrandt; it was rather the one-sided expression of a materialistic and pessimistic age, and it is perhaps on that account that Mr Strachey chooses to call the period from 1850 to 1880 the 'age of criticism' rather than 'the age of realism' or 'science' as a Frenchman would do. He justifies his choice of a term by practically confining his remarks to Sainte-Beuve, Flaubert, the *Parnassiens*, and Baudelaire, Flaubert getting the lion's share. The critical historians, Renan and Taine, are dismissed with a few lines, and the dramatists who were critics of social life, Augier and Dumas fils, are omitted altogether. The next phase of French literature began, not with the death of Flaubert in 1880, but rather with the publication in 1886 of Vogüé's *Le roman russe*, the firstfruits of the new spiritualistic movement. Mr Strachey gives only two examples of this latest period, Maupassant and Verlaine, but of these Maupassant, a truer representative of pure naturalism than either Flaubert or Zola, distinctly belongs to the preceding period. Mr Strachey rightly says at the outset of his last chapter that 'a just estimate' of the work of those writers who belong to these two last phases 'is well nigh impossible: it is so close to us that it is bound to be out of focus.' It is equally impossible to form a just estimate of either period as a whole.

It only remains to congratulate Mr Strachey on the success of his achievement, which cannot fail to give pleasure to all lovers of French literature. If he has omitted some names which should have been included, that is at any rate better than giving a perfunctory account of them. If he has neglected two departments of French literature, in which it is particularly rich, memoirs and letters, that is no doubt because his interest does not lie in that direction. The great merit of his little book is that it expresses sincerely and brilliantly his own opinions, and that these opinions are those of an essentially sane critic, and of one who is in close sympathy with the French mind and the French character.

Arthur Tilley.

Cambridge.

Life of the Black Prince by the Herald of Sir John Chandos. Edited from the MS. in Worcester College with linguistic and historical notes. By Mildred K. Pope and Eleanor C. Lodge. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910. 8vo. lxii + 256 pp.

The contents of the Worcester College MS. have long been known to philologists and especially to historians, first through the edition of H. O. Coxe, printed for the Roxburghe Club (1842)[1], and later also through the publication of M. Francisque Michel (1883). The former

[1] Not 1862, as is erroneously stated in the Introduction, p. vii, l. 3. The correct date, however, appears in the footnote.

was a careful reproduction of the MS., with all its faults and blunders; the latter claimed to be a critical edition, but suffered, like most of M. Michel's enormous literary output, from haste and lack of accuracy. No such fault can be found with the scholarly production of Miss Pope and Miss Lodge. The joint editors possess to a high degree the philological and historical equipment required to carry out successfully the task they had set themselves, and to produce what may well be called an *édition définitive* of this curious and interesting document of the end of the fourteenth century.

The subject of the poem is well known. To quote the words of the editors, 'it is not so much a continuous historical narrative as a record of the leading events in the life of this same Prince, and a eulogy upon his prowess and piety...The Herald begins by a brief description of Edward III's campaign of 1345, culminating in the battle of Crécy, and followed by the capture of Calais. He gives some details of the plot for the recovery of that town at the end of 1349, and then passes almost at once to the years 1355 and 1356, giving a detailed and valuable account of the victory of Poitiers. After this we come, however, to what is by far the most important part of the poem, that in which he treats of the events in which he himself took part: the Spanish expedition made by the Black Prince on behalf of Pedro of Castile, and the battle of Najera or Navarete. Having completed the history of this period, he gives a very brief and sketchy account of the disastrous end of Prince Edward's government of Gascony, and of the war which led to the loss of almost all the possessions acquired at Brétigny, and then with considerable detail recounts the close of his hero's career and his dying moments.' The Herald's account of the Spanish campaign appears to have been utilised by Froissart in his famous Chronicle, and on that score alone must commend itself to students of history. But the poem will appeal quite as strongly to philologists and literary critics. No trouble has been spared in the present edition to deal adequately with the questions of authorship, dialect, phonology and syntax. If I am rightly informed, Miss Pope, a former student of M. Paul Meyer and herself a doctor of the University of Paris, is mainly responsible for this part of the work. If so, she deserves our gratitude for the competent and scholarly way in which she has acquitted herself of a difficult task.

The editors have very little to tell us about the personality of the author, beyond the fact that he was in the service of Sir John Chandos and accompanied his master on the Spanish expedition. What is advanced regarding his origin and nationality, is mostly conjectural and based on internal evidence alone. The theory that the Herald was a Frenchman by birth seems very plausible; that he came from the North Eastern part of France rather than from Brittany, as was surmised by Gröber (*Grundriss*, II, p. 1085), is not improbable. But it is more difficult to admit that the Herald was a native of 'Valenciennes or its neighbourhood' simply on the grounds that the language in which the poem was 'probably' first written was practically identical with that of Froissart. Unfortunately the original version of c. 1385 is lost, and

the text is preserved only in the 'standardised' version of an Anglo-Norman scribe. The editors have, however, submitted the MS. to the minutest scrutiny, and in several instances they have conclusively shown that the scribe tampered with the original. They have accordingly published a critical text of the poem in the dialect of Hainault, tinged with the few Anglo-Norman peculiarities which might well be expected of a man who, when he began to write, had lived among English nobles for at least twenty-five years. Doubtless the Herald meant his poem to serve for the edification of Englishmen and for that very reason he may have indulged in more Anglo-Normanisms than the editors credit him with. On that point, however, the reader can draw his own conclusions, for the text of the MS. has been carefully transcribed and printed side by side with the revised version. With such an arrangement we have no fault to find; but the question suggests itself, whether it was worth the increase of labour, to reproduce in type all the abbreviations of the MS., especially as these abbreviations do not differ in any way from those usually found in Anglo-Norman MSS. of the time, and do not present the least difficulty of interpretation.

The elaboration of the critical text appears to have been prompted and, to some extent, supervised by as learned and eminent an authority as M. Paul Meyer. This fact alone would constitute a guarantee of its reliability, even if the editors had not repeatedly given signal proof of their own ability and scholarship. I should like, however, to suggest a few emendations:

v. 119 is too short, read *Barons et banerez....*

v. 343, retain the reading of the MS., i.e. *Uns roys et uns....*

v. 682, the emendation *leur* for *la ou* is hardly justified; it would be preferable to omit either *ou* or *il.*

v. 1058, read *Onc on ne vit tele appareille*; for if *tel* were used substantively, we should hardly expect the construction *tel pareille*, except in very corrupt Anglo-Norman.

v. 1131 is too short, read *Au Roy que Englois....*

v. 1373, read *Et des autres plus de doi mille.*

v. 2064, retain the reading of the MS., *Ore n'ay je...*; if *or* is substituted for *ore* the line becomes too short.

v. 2283, retain *Estephen*; for *Estephene* renders the line too long.

v. 2347, read *Et des autres bien quatre mille.*

v. 2631 is one syllable short, read *Rengie feurent la tout le jour.*

v. 3010 is too short, read *Si est* for *S'est*[1].

v. 3099 is too long, read *iij mille et cens*, or *iij mille v cens* (as suggested in the note to this line; cf. p. 176).

v. 3134 is too short; M. P. Meyer's emendation, given in the notes, p. 176, should certainly have been adopted.

v. 3237 is too long, read *Estephen* as in *v.* 2283. (It is at all events

[1] The editors have taken it for granted that the original had *se*, and not *si*, throughout. It might, however, be objected that the use of *si* is confirmed by the fact that this spelling occurs three times in the rhymes, viz. *vv.* 1874, 1922, 2378.

hardly logical to propose *Estephene* in one case and *Estiephenes* in the other, both being in the nom. sg.)

vv. 3436—7, another emendation might be suggested, viz. *Vous fac assavoir que amont Fu l'enchauz perilleus et fiers*; *l'* for *li* occurs frequently enough, cf. p. xxxviii (1).

A few inconsistencies on the part of the editors might also be pointed out. Some, indeed, are rectified in the notes and are therefore omitted here. It is probably due to an oversight that the spelling *champ* has sometimes been retained, e.g. *vv.* 356, 363, 655, 681, etc., whilst elsewhere it has been altered to *camp*, e.g. *vv.* 13, 1389, 1532, etc. The scribe spelt the word invariably with *ch*, but there is good reason to think that the original had *c* and not *ch*, seeing that on two occasions the copyist has confused the word with *tamps* (cf. *vv.* 51, 2035).

One might ask also why in *v.* 667 *chastelx* is altered to *chastiaux*, whilst in *v.* 797 it becomes *chastialx*; why *mareschalx* is retained in *vv.* 1209, 3064, whilst *mareschaux* is preferred in *vv.* 1199, 3402. The use of the abbreviations A.N. and A.F. (cf. pp. xl, xliii, xlvi, etc.), to denote apparently one and the same thing, should have been avoided. It is difficult also to admit with the editors that in *v.* 3977 *leure* is a contraction for *la ou* (cf. p. xxviii, l. 3).

Finally a few trifling slips have escaped the vigilance of the editors, e.g.:

p. xiv, l. 17, *Felleton* '*quadrisyllabic*' is obviously meant for *F.* '*trisyllabic*.'

p. xxv, l. 14, instead of 3391, read 3390.

p. xxviii, l. 4, instead of 681 read 682.

p. xl, l. 12, instead of *plus de vi mille* read *plus de iiij mille.*

p. xlii, l. 4, instead of 2943 read 2944.

p. xliv, l. 11, instead of 123 read 124.

The text is followed by an excellent English translation of the whole poem. I think, however, that the editors have missed the meaning of the following passage:

95 Ore est raisons que je vous conte
De ce dont on doit faire acompte:
C'est du fait de (= que) chevalerie
En sa persone fu norie,
En le quele il regna xxx ans.

They have introduced a colon after *chevalerie* and translated: 'and now it is right that I should relate to you that which all should hold in esteem—that is, chivalry: this was upheld in his person, in whom it held sway thirty years.' This rendering is not satisfactory, and the agreement of *il* (masc.) with *chevalerie* (fem.) cannot be defended. I would suggest the following translation: 'and now it is right that I should tell you of the fact which must be taken into account, viz., that chivalry was cultivated in him, and that for thirty years he was supreme in it (i.e., in chivalry).' This is in perfect agreement with historical facts, for the Black Prince won his spurs at Crécy in 1346 and remained

a pattern of knighthood till his death in 1376, i.e. exactly thirty years.

The edition contains also a fairly complete Glossary (*frike* 1512, fem. of *fres, frais* should have been included), and an excellent index of proper names. The references appear to have been checked with the greatest care and the whole work is remarkably free from errors and misprints. The editors deserve our warmest thanks for their valuable contribution to scholarship.

P. STUDER.

SOUTHAMPTON.

La Lyre d'Amour: an Anthology of French Love Poems from earliest times down to 1866. Selected and annotated by CHARLES B. LEWIS. London: Chatto and Windus. 1911. xxiii + 262 pp.

Les poètes du moyen âge occupent à eux seuls un bon quart du volume. Ce fait, à lui seul, témoigne de l'originalité du recueil. Félicitons M. Lewis d'avoir fait la part si belle à la vieille poésie. Il n'est pas sans se rendre compte que bien des lecteurs auront peine à la comprendre, et il écrit dans sa préface: 'Owing to limited space...I have only been able to annotate a certain proportion of the points that call for explanation, but I have tried to select those which would give the greatest difficulty to anyone not possessing a knowledge of the old language.' Ces notes aideront beaucoup ceux à qui le français ancien est non point inconnu, mais peu familier: je doute qu'elles soient d'un grand secours à ceux qui l'ignorent. D'autant plus que M. Lewis, très sagement du reste, nous présente les vieux poètes dans leur dialecte original. Je ne vois guère, par exemple, comment 'anyone not possessing a knowledge of the old language' pourra goûter les deux 'canchons' artésiennes de Conon de Béthune. M. Lewis a raison lorsqu'il juge préférable d'annoter en français moderne les vieux trouvères: mais je pense que le moyen le plus sûr d'initier les profanes aux beautés des œuvres du moyen âge est encore de leur offrir, à côté du texte ancien, une traduction complète en prose moderne.

Le volume est élégant, imprimé en jolis caractères sur bon papier. Malheureusement, trop de fautes déparent le texte. Certaines se corrigent aisément, fautes d'accents ou lettres interverties. D'autres sont moins apparentes et rendent le vers faux.

Voici quelques corrections: p. 84, l. 1, Quand ton col *de* couleur de rose.—p. 141, l. 14, Je m'y suis *plu* depuis...—p. 169, III l. 1, Oh! ne les *pleure* point ces lettres inquiètes.—p. 180, l. 13, Que le bonheur s'enfuit sur *l'aile* des années.—p. 190, II l. 1, Si tu ne m'aimais pas, dis-moi, *fille* insensée.—p. 201, l. 6, *Qu'*on la voit, béante, se tordre...—p. 214, l. 5, Je vis le pied de sa jeune *compagne*.—p. 218, l. 21, Quoi donc! c'est *vainement* qu'ici nous nous aimâmes...—p. 220, l. 5, Eh bien! oubliez-*nous*...—p. 225, l. 7, Par dessus les *vertes* collines.

Voici encore deux ou trois fautes relevées dans les notes: p. 5, note 2, quand *il* (l'embrassade) me manque, lisez *elle*.—p. 22, note 10, löé est

mal traduit par logé, reçu. Il signifie conseillé et il est expliqué deux vers plus bas, Et s'il m'a bon conseil doné....C'est bien, si je ne me trompe, le sens que lui donne M. Huet.—p. 98, Dire que Baïf 'made various metrical innovations and even endeavoured to unite music and poetry' est vague et peu exact. Ronsard et les poètes de son école ont insisté sur l'union étroite de la musique et de la poésie. Il eût fallu ajouter que Baïf tenta d'introduire dans la poésie française la métrique des Grecs et des Latins.

Malgré ces quelques taches, ce livre est une des anthologies les mieux conçues et les plus attrayantes qui aient paru récemment en Angleterre. Le choix des morceaux est intéressant. M. Lewis n'a pas toujours été guidé par la beauté musicale du vers. Les dernières lignes de son introduction tendent à le faire croire. Il y est plus que sévère—injuste pour les Symbolistes. Il méconnait ce qu'il y avait d'intelligent et d'utile dans les modifications qu'ils ont tenté d'apporter à la technique du vers français. Ils voulaient, par des méthodes parfois excessives peut-être, libérer le poète des lisières d'une versification traditionnelle et dogmatique, en rejetant certaines règles devenues désuètes et arbitraires, sinon absurdes. Ils prétendaient que l'oreille fût la seule autorité devant qui s'incline le poète, dont l'art consiste à exprimer en une langue harmonieuse et rythmée, c'est-à-dire musicale, ses idées et ses sentiments. Que M. Lewis se rassure: le symbolisme n'est plus; 'le temps des étranges théories et des exagérations' semble être passé, et peu nombreux sont les poètes vivants qui ne tendent leurs épaules au joug ancien, à peine allégé!

André Barbier.

Aberystwyth.

Histoire de la Poésie française au seizième siècle. Tome I: *L'École des Rhétoriqueurs.* Par Henry Guy. Paris: H. Champion. 1910. 8vo. 390 pp.

Le nombre est considérable des ouvrages parus depuis une vingtaine d'années sur les écrivains français de la Renaissance. La plupart sont des études de détail, beaucoup sont remarquables et l'histoire littéraire de cette période en a été renouvelée. Actuellement encore toute une armée de chercheurs est à l'œuvre et chaque mois apporte de nouvelles découvertes. On peut donc se demander si le moment était opportun pour composer un travail d'ensemble sur le xvi^{e} siècle. C'est ce que s'est proposé M. Guy: c'est un dessein courageux et désintéressé. Il sait bien qu'une telle histoire est sans doute condamnée à vieillir vite; mais il sait aussi qu'il est bon qu'un ouvrage général ne se fasse point trop attendre: il nous permet de nous rendre compte de l'état de la science et joue le rôle d'un inventaire périodique de nos connaissances. C'est bien ainsi, semble-t-il, que se présentera l'histoire de M. Guy. Mais ce premier volume est, et devait être, beaucoup plus que cela. Dans ces fouilles organisées de tous côtés dans notre xvi^{e} siècle, le

quartier des Rhétoriqueurs a été fort négligé. M. Guy n'a pas eu ici à réunir et à mettre au point les résultats obtenus par ses prédécesseurs. Il a dû fonder son travail sur les recherches auxquelles il se consacre depuis de longues années et faire œuvre originale. Sachons lui en gré. Il serait difficile en effet de trouver un terrain plus ingrat et une tâche plus rebutante. Dans cette école des Rhétoriqueurs, les hommes, sauf de rares exceptions, sont médiocres et, trop souvent, les œuvres présentent 'un modèle parfait de platitude sans défaillance,' le style n'est qu'un 'galimatias solennel, un idiome comique et monstrueux,' et de l'un d'eux (Jean Molinet) M. Guy va jusqu'à dire que 'si l'on ne connaissait pas la loyauté de ses intentions, on croirait qu'il a pris à tâche de rendre grotesques les choses qu'il célébrait.'

Il était légitime, néanmoins, d'étudier longuement ces pauvretés. D'abord à cause de l'admiration et de l'importance que les contemporains leur ont accordées; mais surtout parce qu'on ne doit point oublier 'que ces niaiseries ne disparurent pas avec les Rhétoriqueurs; ils les transmirent aux écoles suivantes.' Cette influence profonde et durable des Rhétoriqueurs, beaucoup la soupçonnaient, peu la connaissaient: M. Guy nous la dévoile, nette et précise. Laissons de côté Rabelais, qui s'était nourri des Rhétoriqueurs, où il a puisé mainte idée et maint procédé de langue et de style (cf. entre autres les §§ 190, 211, 298, 299, 347, 371, 435, 620). Mais, pour ne prendre qu'un exemple, Ronsard ne sera bien connu et compris qu'autant qu'on se rendra compte de ce qu'il doit, non pas seulement à C. Marot, ainsi que l'a si bien montré M. Laumonier, mais aussi aux Rhétoriqueurs dont il est loin de s'être complètement dégagé tout d'abord. M. Guy va plus loin encore: mais il est difficile de le suivre lorsqu'il écrit que 'considérée sous un certain angle, la réforme de Malherbe n'est qu'une restauration de la tyrannie des syllabes' (p. 100). La raison de Malherbe n'a guère rien de commun avec la raison des Rhétoriqueurs: elle s'appuie sur l'usage et le bon sens. L'école des Rhétoriqueurs méritait donc une étude longue, minutieuse et complète. M. Guy ne nous l'a point donnée. La grave difficulté dont il s'explique dans son avant-propos tient beaucoup au plan général qu'il a adopté. Qu'il nous permette d'exprimer le regret qu'il n'ait point franchement abordé le problème et qu'il s'en soit tenu à une demi-solution. Il a déterminé d'écrire une Histoire de la poésie au xvi^{e} siècle et il faut bien qu'il y comprenne les Rhétoriqueurs. Mais si cette école 's'est étendue sur tout le premier tiers de ce siècle, elle florissait (ou sévissait) bien avant qu'il commençât.' M. Guy se refuse à 'entreprendre, à propos du xvi^{e} siècle, l'examen du xv^{e} presque entier.' Il rejette la méthode 'arbitraire et puérile' qui consisterait à partir de l'an 1500. Il adopte un autre parti, celui de s'occuper uniquement des Rhétoriqueurs qui sont morts après 1500. La méthode est-elle moins arbitraire et moins puérile? Voyons ce qu'elle entraine. M. Guy divise son volume en trois livres: le premier traite des caractères généraux, le second et le troisième des grands et des petits Rhétoriqueurs. Le premier chapitre du premier livre est consacré aux sources. Il renferme un bref aperçu des origines de l'école et une légère esquisse

des principaux Rhétoriqueurs morts avant 1500. Il se trouve donc que Jean Meschinot est exécuté en deux pages et Georges Chastellain, le grand Georges, en quatre, tandis que Molinet, étant mort après 1500, aura à lui tout seul, dans le second livre, seize pages et André de la Vigne dix-sept! M. Guy nous dit bien que 'l'école des Rhétoriqueurs est restée avant, après 1500 immuable en ses tendances, obstinément fidèle à ses doctrines.' Il n'en est pas moins vrai que ce manque de proportion choque et qu'il est grand dommage que M. Guy se soit astreint à un plan qui l'obligeait à couper l'école en deux, à glisser aussi rapidement sur le xv^e^ siècle et à se contenter de 'rattacher à leurs prédécesseurs les auteurs qu'il se proposait d'étudier plus loin.'

Si nous nous montrons aussi difficiles, la faute en est à M. Guy lui-même. Il traite avec tant de talent la partie du sujet à laquelle il s'est volontairement limité, il égaye de tant d'esprit et de bonne humeur l'aridité de la matière, qu'il nous entraine à sa suite, intéressés et charmés, dans son voyage d'exploration parmi les broussailles épineuses de la Grande Rhétorique. Mais il éveille en notre esprit des curiosités nouvelles. Nous voyons combien les Rhétoriqueurs pénètrent avant dans le xvi^e^ siècle: nous aurions aimé qu'il nous retraçât avec autant de précision et de détail les origines de leur école. Le rapide aperçu que renferment les quatre ou cinq premières pages du premier chapitre de son ouvrage ne nous satisfait plus. Nous regrettons d'autant plus que M. Guy n'ait point entrepris cette enquête qu'il est le savant le mieux qualifié pour la mener à bien: nous ne renonçons pas à l'espoir qu'il veuille bien s'y occuper un jour.

Découper l'histoire d'une littérature en siècles est illusoire et stérile: la découper en genres ne l'est guère moins. M. Guy compose une histoire de la poésie française au xvi^e^ siècle. Il est amené à consacrer tout un volume aux Rhétoriqueurs. Or il se trouve que les Rhétoriqueurs 'ont fondé sur la confusion des genres, le genre qu'ils regardaient comme le plus magnifique.' Et leurs gros ouvrages sont, la plupart, un mélange de prose et de vers, où l'on ne saurait découvrir la moindre raison pourquoi ce qui est dit en vers ne l'est pas en prose, ni pourquoi ce qui est en prose n'est pas en vers. Comment donc justifier une méthode qui consiste à écarter la prose pour ne retenir que ce qui est rimé? Sans doute la règle de M. Guy n'est point de fer: elle cède et plie à l'occasion. Il en est réduit néanmoins à 'saluer en passant' une œuvre aussi considérable que les *Illustrations de Gaule et Singularités de Troye* de Jean Lemaire de Belges.

Tel qu'il est, l'ouvrage de M. Guy est précieux. Le premier livre nous fournit des renseignements beaucoup plus complets et plus sûrs que ceux dont nous disposions sur les centres artistiques au xv^e^ et au xvi^e^ siècle, sur la situation matérielle des écrivains et sur leurs mécènes. Nous aurions voulu des preuves plus convaincantes de l'importance que M. Guy accorde à Lyon, comme centre littéraire et artistique dès le xv^e^ siècle. Les chapitres sur la matière poétique et ses principaux ornements, sur les complications et les jeux rythmiques, sur les genres poétiques sont excellents. M. Guy conserve la distinction traditionnelle

entre les grands et les petits Rhétoriqueurs, mais il a soin de nous avertir qu'il sait combien elle est artificielle. Elle repose sur la faveur plus ou moins grande dont les Rhétoriqueurs ont joui auprès des puissants du jour et aussi, hélas ! sur la quantité de leurs écrits plus que sur leur qualité. Les petits furent parfois supérieurs aux grands 'parce qu'ils ont eu la chance de travailler à l'écart, de s'affranchir au moins en partie des règles et des modes qui abêtissaient les prétendus habiles, les écrivains patentés !' Ce fut le cas de Jean Parmentier que M. Guy, à notre joie, s'est efforcé de réhabiliter.

L'exécution matérielle du livre est bonne. Le texte est clair et se présente bien ; il est divisé en paragraphes numérotés ; point de notes au bas des pages, donc point de chiffres et de renvois continuels qui sont une fatigue pour l'œil et pour l'esprit. Une bibliographie et des références suivent chaque chapitre. Il y aurait eu avantage à les reporter à la fin du volume, avant l'index des noms propres. Et si les sommaires placés en tête des chapitres avaient été incorporés à la table des matières, l'ouvrage eût été plus facile à consulter. Nous regrettons de ne point trouver dans la Bibliographie de Jean Marot l'étude vieillie mais si vivante de Prof. Henry Morley, publiée dans 'C. Marot and other Studies' (2 vols. 1871). Nous souhaitons que M. Guy ne nous fasse point longtemps attendre les autres volumes de son *Histoire.*

André Barbier.

Aberystwyth.

Del Rinnovamento d'Italia. Per Vincenzo Gioberti. A cura di Fausto Nicolini. (*Scrittori d'Italia,* xiv, xvi, xxiv.) Bari : G. Laterza e Figli. 8vo. 372 + 395 + 385 pp.

Lirici Marinisti. A cura di Benedetto Croce. (Same Series, i.) 559 pp.

Poesie di Iacopo Vittorelli. A cura di Attilio Simioni. (Same Series, xii.) 391 pp.

Le Maccheronee. Di Merlin Cocai (Teofilo Folengo). A cura di Alessandro Luzio. (Same Series, x, xix.) 352 + 373 pp.

So ambitious seemed the programme of this collection of Italian classics, that we delayed our criticism until, in Machiavelli's words, we had 'ferma esperienza' of the new venture. By now we presume that every reader, who takes even a cursory interest in Italian literature, will be convinced by reference to the volumes on his shelves, that Senatore Croce the promoter, Signor Nicolini the general editor of the series and the firm of Giuseppe Laterza e Figli ought to be congratulated on the success, which crowns most deservedly their enterprise. Twenty or even ten years ago such an undertaking would not have been thought of in Italy, or, if attempted, would have met with scant recognition. Books still found then a very limited market in the peninsula ; and apart from the general improvement in social conditions, it is certainly

due to the disinterested labours of Italian scholars that the present revival has been made possible. The new fervour of political life is appropriately crowned by a more intense love for the old writers; and we may say without hesitation that this collection, by satisfying a need much felt, is in its department the crowning achievement of this literary revival. To our mind the search for old editions is often illogical. No doubt some original impressions are of considerable value to the student and may seem to an over-sensitive reader with their yellowish paper and faded type more attuned to the archaic style of the writers. But really valuable editions have risen of late to figures far beyond the reach of the average reader, while others, which are sought after on account of their date and bring high prices, are really worthless. Whereas we could not have a library edition more worthily printed, or more scholarly and accurate texts than those provided by this series. A whole army of editors, each a specialist in his field, have stood sponsors to these volumes; yet the editors have exercised such restraint that the reader is not troubled with a cumbersome critical apparatus or with lengthy introductory notes. They have almost entirely effaced their labours and liberally allowed the public to enjoy the results.

Out of the twenty odd volumes which have already been issued it seems fitting to consider first the work of one of the 'prophets' of the 'Risorgimento,' Vincenzo Gioberti. He had already written that thought-stirring book *Del primato civile degli Italiani*, had had a brief and unlucky spell of active political life as premier in the Piedmontese government of 1849, and had fled into voluntary exile to Paris, when, in 1851, he published the absorbing work which is here reprinted. The history of the 'Risorgimento' has been studied so intently of late that the reissue of this book cannot but be welcome. Previous editions are scarce or valueless. The present editor, Signor Nicolini, tells us of the remarkable success obtained by this book. We cannot wonder at it. We learn that even Victor Emanuel II, by no means a lover of books, carefully perused this one, which is steeped in the passionate atmosphere of those days. The devotion to Italy, almost religious in character, of Dante and Machiavel finds an echo in these pages, and Gioberti's stern and rather dogmatic forecasts, often verified by subsequent events, fill us with admiration for his genius. The editor's restraint has been perhaps carried too far; a few brief notes such as those added by Senatore Croce to volumes I and XI would have rendered fuller and easier the enjoyment of this work, to those who are not fully acquainted with the undercurrents and the minor episodes of the Italian revolution. The *Rinnovamento* was not a forgotten work, but in the case of other works in this collection the lack of recent reprints and the rarity of old editions have caused their authors to be all but forgotten. It is one of the values of the present collection that, by reprinting little known works, it will no doubt remedy this lamentable tendency. While the seventeenth century bids fair to regain popularity in painting and sculpture, it still suffers under Alfieri's sweeping judgment of it with regard to its literature: 'il seicento delirò.' Senatore Croce has himself

undertaken to prepare a large selection from the mass of lyrics of this period. The reader of his *Lirici Marinisti* will be pleasantly surprised by the subtle charm of some of these poems, most of which were hitherto practically unknown. The present editor, we fear, has somewhat overrated the value of these poets in his *Saggi di Letteratura Italiana del Seicento* (Bari, Laterza, 1910), but since he may claim to be their discoverer, he may have been blinded by a kind of paternal affection for them[1]. There are poems of very different value here, but on the whole we find ourselves amidst a revelry of captivating harmonies; haunting melodies accompany us while we skim the more 'euphuistic' specimens and we are arrested occasionally by lyrics which evince a deep and passionate understanding of nature. The essential qualities of these poets are fluency and melody, and a sensuous exaggeration of sounds, such as we readily connect with musical Italy of the seventeenth century. But even though we may not be wholly satisfied that Fontanella has claims to a higher rank than Marino, as Senatore Croce suggests, this volume makes it clear that the traditional valuation of seventeenth century authors requires to be readjusted, and that new studies might bear good fruit in this field[2].

The eighteenth shares with the preceding century a certain lack of favour among modern readers. Our great-grandmothers knew Metastasio by heart and adored Vittorelli; nowadays Metastasio is all too frequently dismissed without sufficient consideration and Vittorelli is ignored. The latter's poems now appear for the first time in a complete edition. Signor Simioni, who gave us five years ago a painstaking account of the poet's uneventful life[3], is perhaps more lavish in his praise than we might feel inclined to be. Vittorelli's muse was amazingly melodious when composing 'canzonette' or anacreontics, but his sonnets are loosely knitted and his satiric poems lack the point and the gravity of Parini's. After reading *Il Tupé*, *Il Naso*, or *I Maccheroni*, we go back with renewed pleasure to the 'canzonette.' A few unpublished poems are added to those which Vittorelli printed at divers times, but they certainly do not enhance his reputation.

The editing of works like Vittorelli's or Gioberti's does not offer very great difficulties, but Folengo's Latin poems make greater demands on the conscientious editor. Signor Luzio had given a good deal of his varied and brilliant activity to the solution of the many problems connected with Macheronic poetry. Folengo left four different renderings of his masterpiece; and the opinions which have been given of it have varied according to the edition which the critic preferred. De Sanctis did much to show the deep seriousness of this apparently irrepressible joker, probably because he had studied the *Baldus* in its fourth revision.

[1] Senatore Croce avoids however the exaggerations which are to be read in another book on the period, M. Rigillo, *Il Seicento e i Pregiudizi sul Secentismo*, Cagliari, 1907.

[2] Reference might be made to an interesting book by M. Gabriel Maugain, *Étude sur l'évolution intellectuelle de l'Italie de* 1657 *à* 1750 *environ*, Paris, Hachette, 1909.

[3] Attilio Simioni, *Iacopo Vittorelli, La Vita e gli Scritti*, Rocca S. Casciano, 1907 (Vol. VIII of the series *Indagini di storia letteraria e artistica*, dirette da Guido Mazzoni).

But later critics have held widely different views. Signor Luzio's editorial note will, we think, bring order into what has been chaos. Merlin Cocai was not only a consummate artist, an indefatigable chiseller of the strange language he chose, but also a man with a lofty conception of life, deeply humane and ever striving to bring about a moral reform by his humorous exposure of vice. He was so intensely earnest about his work that he submitted his *Baldus* to three revisions. The first edition (Venice, 1517–18) gives us the mere framework of the poem. This he revised and modified for the reprint of 1521 (Toscolana), which was the one known to Rabelais[1]; and he again improved upon it in the so-called Cipadense edition (probably 1539–40). He strove continuously to render his style more comic and more expressive, his representation of life more realistic, though with much praiseworthy restraint, and finally to give to the whole poem the polish of art. For a long time critics have refused to accept the authenticity of Folengo's poems in the form in which they were edited by Vigasio Coccaio (Venice, 1552); but Signor Luzio shows that this edition was the result of a final, if incomplete revision, but as far as it goes a most successful one. In the present reissue the text is taken from Vigasio's reprint. But in this admirable edition of Laterza nothing essential is omitted; all important various readings from the Cipadense are given in full; and also the amusing prefatory notes from the Tusculana are reprinted. The notes of the Tusculana are embodied in the glossary, so that all possible assistance is given to the student without causing annoyance to the general reader. It will indeed be surprising if this reprint does not encourage some further research into Folengo's life and works. Signor Luzio himself has given us a promise[2]. His suggestion that a youthful crime imputed to Giovan Ludovico Folengo should possibly be ascribed to Teofilo, may provide us with the key to the strain of sadness which pervades the works of this fitful and interesting writer.

C. Foligno.

Oxford.

Tristan und Isolde von Gottfried von Strassburg. Neu bearbeitet von Wilhelm Hertz. Sechste Auflage, mit einem Nachtrag von Wolfgang Golther. Stuttgart: Cotta. 1911. 8vo. 580 pp.

Wilhelm Hertz happily combined the qualities of a profound scholar with the genius of a true poet; his original lyric and epic verse and his adaptations of Old French and Middle High German poets are alike distinguished by perfection of form and language, by vivid intuition and an admirable plastic power. Most of these 'translations,' using the word in its widest sense, are supplemented by introductions and explanatory notes which sum up in an able manner the results of

[1] Vol. II, p. 363, where reference to other authorities is given.

[2] In the review he wrote of Signor Biondolillo's book in the *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, LVIII (1911), pp. 392–93.

scholarly research. It is obvious that these additions have to be revised from time to time according to the advance of our knowledge, while the translation must retain the form given to it by the poet himself. It is in this manner that G. Rosenhagen treated Hertz's adaptation of the *Parzival* of Wolfram von Eschenbach, and that W. Golther now deals with Hertz's *Tristan*. But what Golther has done here is to reproduce in full Hertz's comments and to add a short supplement to them. We cannot altogether approve of this method, especially with regard to the work in question. Research into the origin and the complicated development of the Tristan saga, and particularly into the sources of the Middle High German poem, has been much influenced since the death of Hertz by the critical editions of the French Tristan epics (cp. E. Muret, *Le roman de Tristan par Béroul et un anonyme*, 1903, and J. Bédier, *Le roman de Tristan par Thomas*, 1902 and 1905); and it has been proved that both these poems and all known poems on Tristan go back to a French prose romance of the middle of the twelfth century, which has not been preserved. Whoever compares the different poetic forms of the Tristan saga now has to refer to this common source. But Golther merely corrects the main lines of Hertz's deductions and reproduces in their original form the 146 notes, which are now to a considerable extent antiquated. We think that Hertz himself would not have agreed with so reverential a method of treatment. Note 25 quotes Bédier's *Spécimen*, although the complete edition might now be referred to; and note 1 cites Golther's earlier papers on the Tristan saga, while his excellent book *Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, Leipzig, 1907, which supplants the former, is only mentioned in a supplementary note. We hope that Hertz's *Tristan* will be reprinted again and again, but we hope, too, that the explanatory part of the book will be recast in a form which will meet the approval of scholars.

ROBERT PETSCH.

LIVERPOOL.

Das Oxforder Buch deutscher Dichtung vom zwölften bis zum zwanzigsten Jahrhundert. Herausgegeben von H. G. FIEDLER. Mit einem Geleitwort von GERHART HAUPTMANN. Oxford: University Press. 8vo. xii + 596 pp.

The inclusion of a volume devoted to German poetry in the attractive series of Oxford Books of Poetry was obviously only a question of time; for by general consent the literature of Germany is better adapted than any other modern literature to have its most precious essence distilled in an anthology of this kind. And may it not also be claimed for German lyric poetry that it is—we will not say the greatest in the world, for lyric poetry is so intimately personal and national an art that every right-feeling nation must perforce regard its own as the greatest in the world—but as the

supreme and predominating element in German literature, the most intimate expression of the nation's temperament?

The present volume has but a brief preface by the editor; we might have preferred a lengthier introduction, more in the manner of the introductions to the earlier volumes of the series; but perhaps Professor Fiedler felt that this would have meant curtailing unduly the poetry itself; and after all, that is the main thing. On the other hand, we think the 'Geleitwort' by Dr Gerhart Hauptmann, who evidently had great difficulty in finding anything to say at all, might have easily been dispensed with.

With regard to the selection of lyrics, it is difficult a little to criticise, and criticism is hardly in place; for obviously everyone will have his own ideas as to what should and what should not be included in a book that he regards as a personal friend. And in German poetry the task is doubly difficult, as the range of great poetry to choose from is so enormously wide. From the purely English point of view the objection might be raised that the selection has been guided rather by what a cultured German reader considers his great poetry than by what we in England appreciate as great German poetry; but this is, no doubt, an extremely delicate point to settle. In an anthology of English poetry published in Germany we should naturally look for a much larger representation of Byron and a much smaller representation of Wordsworth than the English reader would demand; in the same way, it would be reasonable to look for similar modifications in a German anthology published in England. We are not sure if Professor Fiedler has sufficiently kept this consideration in view. On the whole, however, he has chosen wisely, and probably most readers will have little fault to find with the compromise he has made between the demands of the many-headed public and his own personal taste.

The difficulty of selection has been increased by the fact that the editor has elected to make his volume an anthology, not merely of lyric poetry, but of poetry in general, including often verse in which the lyric element is hardly present at all. The collection would, we think, have left a more self-contained impression had it been restricted to purely lyric poetry. There seems, for instance, little justification for including in such an anthology the 'Fable of the Rings' from Lessing's *Nathan*. The wideness of Professor Fiedler's net has also led to his devoting no less than sixty-six pages to Schiller, who can only be called a lyric poet in a modified and limited sense, while the most many-voiced of all modern lyric poets, Goethe, has only forty-two. We think, especially in a case like this, Professor Fiedler would have done well to keep in view the consideration of English versus German taste, to which we have referred. The selection from Goethe's poetry, however, seems to us a particularly happy one, and could hardly have been improved upon.

The poets of the nineteenth century are well represented. Here, again, if we might express a purely personal taste, we should have liked a greater variety, not of authors, but of kinds of poetry; the

business of a good anthology is not only to give us a nation's great poetry, but to show the width of range of such great poetry. There is a tendency to harp unduly on two lyric strains, which, no doubt, are prominent in the modern German lyric, but are far from being so much so as they are in this volume; we mean what we might call the sentimental-domestic strain, on the one hand, and the patriotic-warlike on the other. We are not always in agreement with Professor Fiedler's selection from quite modern writers such as Nietzsche and Dehmel; but here again the criterion is one of personal taste. We presume that Stefan George is absent from the collection owing to his well-known antipathy to appearing in anthologies.

The notes are not overladen with explanatory matter, as should be the case in a volume of this kind; and what is said is to the point. A valuable feature is the indication of the composers by whom the songs have been set. In this connection, Richard Strauss has composed for men's voices the *Schlachtlied*, No. 26; and one is tempted to suggest that a lyric from Rückert's wonderful *Kindertotenlieder* might have been included to allow Gustav Mahler's name to appear among the composers.

J. G. Robertson.

London.

Dichtung und Dichter der Zeit. Ein Schilderung der deutschen Literatur der letzten Jahrzehnte. Von Albert Soergel. Leipzig: R. Voigtländer. 1911. 8vo. xii + 892 pp.

Literatur in Deutschland. Studien und Eindrücke. Von Kurt Martens. Berlin: Egon Fleischel und Co. 1910. 8vo. 193 pp.

Masks and Minstrels of New Germany. By Percival Pollard. London: W. Heinemann. 1911. 8vo. viii + 299 pp.

Die Entwicklung der deutschen Literatur seit 1830. Von Georg Witkowski. Leipzig: R. Voigtländer. 1912. 8vo. vi + 165 pp.

The past four decades of the new German Empire will be associated in future histories of literature with keen conflicts between antagonistic literary opinions and persistent endeavours to get at the real problems and the true ideals of literary production. The comprehensive work of Albert Soergel is a valuable attempt to trace the various stages of the recent development, both in its theory and in its practice; Kurt Martens, himself a poet of considerable standing, gives us a series of studies of individual problems and authors, with which we may not always agree, for example, with the high praise he bestows on Helene Böhlau, but the lucid style of Martens' book, and the marked personality of the author, give it a peculiar charm; Georg Witkowski, who is well known as a historian of literature, discusses the

development of German literature since 1830. Lastly, Percival Pollard is an enthusiastic impressionist whose interest lies in the 'lighter muse' and her chief prophet Otto Julius Bierbaum.

The beginning of the new movement was marked by a complete break with tradition. Karl Bleibtreu's *Revolution der Literatur* strikes the keynote. But for their new ideals the younger German writers had to look abroad; they turned to France, to Balzac's *Comédie humaine*, to Flaubert and to the brothers Goncourt and their 'style impressioniste.' *Germinie Lacerteux* (1864) introduced the new social *milieu* into literature, and Emile Zola, their disciple, broadened the realistic social basis to naturalism *sans phrase*. Zola's *Rougon-Macquart* cycle became a kind of fetish to the first generation of these German writers. Soergel deals clearly with this development and with the theory and method of the 'roman expérimental': but something might also have been said for the influence of Darwin, Russel Wallace and, at a later date, Haeckel on literature.

It was only natural that, with the French example before them, these young writers should have first turned to the novel; that form of literature also afforded the best facilities for illustrating their theories. As to the theories themselves, it might be pointed out that they were not essentially foreign to the trend of German thought in the seventies and eighties; as Windelband[1] has shown, this was a time of 'wertlose und geschichtslose Weltanschauung' which followed the breakdown of German idealism in the fifties. The distinguishing marks of these decades were positivism, psychological analysis and a preponderating interest in the historical point of view, the last being represented in literature by Wildenbruch, the contemporary of Treitschke. The philosophic basis of the new movement has, it seems to us, been unduly neglected by Soergel.

At the beginning of this period there were two main literary centres, Munich and Berlin. The chief organ of the Munich poets was *Die Gesellschaft*, edited by their leader, M. G. Conrad, whose personality reminds us of the 'Kraftgenies' of the eighteenth century. The Berlin group of poets, whose leader was Heinrich Hart, were less united in their views. Heinrich Hart and his brother Julius published in 1882 their *Kritische Waffengänge*, in which they opposed the excessive admiration of Zola; but the latter's influence on both the German lyric and the German novel was considerable. Hermann Conradi, who unfortunately died early, was the most promising member of the group; and Karl Henckell wrote lyrics of some merit, although he never rose to the grand passion of a Herwegh. Heinrich Hart, although also lyrically gifted, is mainly important as a critic; he was the first to give expression to the ethic and aesthetic doctrines of the new time. In fiction there was nothing of importance, and Max Kretzer strove in vain to be the German Zola.

An important literary event in 1886 was the formation of the society 'Durch,' of which Eugen Wolff was one of the founders. It

[1] *Die Philosophie im deutschen Geistesleben des 19ten Jahrhunderts*, Tübingen, 1909.

was Wolff who gave the name 'die Moderne' to the new movement, which set up as its models Tolstoi, Dostoevski and Ibsen and thereby accentuated the ethical and psychological problems. The modern drama was banned from the ordinary theatres, and a new home was formed for it in the so-called 'Freie Bühne,' amongst the founders of which were Otto Brahm and Paul Schlenther. The 'Freie Bühne' opened with Ibsen's *Ghosts*, and on October 28, 1889, Gerhart Hauptmann's *Vor Sonnenaufgang* followed in a performance accompanied by stormy scenes. This play was dedicated to Arno Holz, the chief prophet of 'consequent naturalism,' whose theoretical views had a great influence on the art of the theatre. As a poet, Holz was but mediocrely gifted. Naturalism is closely allied with socialism, as is to be seen in the literature of this time; but socialism also contains the germs of individualism and anarchism, a development which is conspicuous in John Henry Mackay, an eclectic lyric poet of Scottish origin. Even still more of an eclectic is Ferdinand Avenarius, who endeavoured to spread literary taste in his *Kunstwart*, and to whom we owe one of the best anthologies of German lyric poetry.

A higher standard is reached by the novelists; by W. Bölsche, who, however, is better known by his popular scientific works; by Clara Viebig, a powerful writer of unflinching psychological insight, whose later works, however, show a remarkable falling-off; and by Ludwig Thoma, a South German satirist, who has given us a convincing picture of Bavarian peasant life in his *Andreas Vöst*. Higher than these stands Wilhelm von Polenz, the author of *Der Büttnerbauer*; and highest of all, Theodor Fontane, from whose *Irrungen, Wirrungen* Soergel reprints a scene which gives a good idea of the beauty of that work. In the drama the first place belongs to Gerhart Hauptmann. In his analysis and appreciation of Hauptmann's plays to 1898, Soergel does not appear to have advanced beyond the standpoint of Schlenther in his biography of Hauptmann[1]; he underestimates *Die Jungfern vom Bischofsberg*, and misunderstands the profound psychology of *Kaiser Karls Geisel*. Soergel only mentions the title of Hauptmann's last drama, *Die Ratten*, which again shows Hauptmann's strength in psychological analysis, and contains, in Frau John, the most successfully drawn of Hauptmann's women. Interesting is Soergel's brief criticism of the rhythm of Hauptmann's language, in which he comes to the conclusion that *Der arme Heinrich* represents 'die Höhe von Hauptmanns Verskunst.' Soergel gives a clear analysis of Hauptmann's novel *Emanuel Quint*, but he might with advantage also have shown how intimately the book is connected with Hauptmann's earlier work. The other dramatists of this period are satisfactorily dealt with; only O. E. Hartleben, of whose personality Pollard gives a more sympathetic picture, seems somewhat undervalued; *Hanna Jagert*, with all its lack of concentration, is a play of considerable literary value.

In Hauptmann's work there are tendencies which point towards

[1] Cp. Robert Petsch, *Gerhart Hauptmann, die Tragödie des* 19. *Jahrhunderts*, in Ilberg's *Neue Jahrbücher* etc., vol. xxi, p. 542 ff.

an abandonment of naturalism; and the theoretical grounds for this abandonment are—though superficially—set forth by Richard Dehmel in his essay on the German 'Alltagstragödie.' The new impulse came again from Romance countries, from Huysmans, Verlaine, Maupassant, Verhaeren, D'Annunzio, Maeterlinck; but the greatest anti-naturalist is himself a German, Friedrich Nietzsche. The centre of this new movement is Vienna, a city where literary traditions were strong and where naturalism had never had much hold. Here the chief dramatists are Hugo von Hofmannsthal and Beer-Hofmann. Greater than the latter is Schmidtbonn, who in his *Graf von Gleichen* has created a play of great beauty and psychological depth, which promises well for his future.

In lyric poetry it is unnecessary to dwell on the originality of Detlev von Liliencron. His influence on his many followers, such as Gustav Falke and Karl Busse, has fostered a kind of unoriginal eclecticism; and to these eclectics must also be reckoned, in spite of Pollard's exaggerated claims for him, Otto Julius Bierbaum. Bierbaum is a pleasant *causeur*, a humourist with an exquisite artistic sense whose style and character are best illustrated by his last publication, *Yankeedoodlefahrt*.

It is difficult to bring the lyric poetry of the time under a single heading. One group of poets is gathered round Arno Holz, with his new ideals of rhymeless verse and his extreme naturalism; others follow Stefan George and form the antipodes of naturalism in their devotion to a formalism that goes back to romantic poets like Hölderlin. Baudelaire, Verlaine and especially the English Pre-Raphaelites are the models of this group; while the symbolism of Maeterlinck is exaggerated to an often incomprehensible mysticism in Mombert and becomes grotesque and fantastic in Paul Scheerbart. All these tendencies in the lyric meet in the poetic individuality of Richard Dehmel—with Liliencron, the greatest modern lyric poet—whose excess of sentiment, however, sometimes leads to exaggeration.

It is difficult to find a single label for the last decade of German literature, 1900—1910; its general aspect and tendencies are too varied, the renaissance of German idealism being perhaps the most characteristic. A lyric poet like Rainer Maria Rilke has naturally some connection with Stefan George, but his Angelus Silesius-like mysticism marks out for him a field peculiarly his own. On the other hand, Arno Holz's theories are to be traced in the work of Otto zur Linde and the 'Charon' poets, although not to the exclusion of individual aims on the part of these writers. 'Back to the primitive' is the motto of this time, that revives Indian 'Schattenspiele' and discovers the original source of poetry in rhythm. An interest is at the same time awakened for a writer whom we regard as the greatest epic poet of modern Germany, Carl Spitteler.

The novel continues to be influenced by romantic and foreign models, French, Russian, Scandinavian, English. Characteristic of it, too, is the 'Los von Berlin' movement, that is to say, the tendency

of decentralisation and the revival of a 'Heimatkunst.' The prophets of this movement are Fritz Lienhart and Adolf Bartels, who, however, have little claim to be regarded as original writers. The novel is much cultivated in South Germany and Austria, but it has not succeeded in arriving at any great achievement. Emil Strauss and Hermann Hesse seem to us unduly praised. In connection with the latter Ludwig Finkh ought to have been mentioned; his *Rosendoktor* has much in common with Hesse's *Peter Camenzind*; and something might also have been said about the Weinheim physician Carillon. The most gifted of the group seems to us Bernhard Kellermann. This writer may not yet have found his final artistic form, but his last novel *Das Meer* is full of high promise. Notable among the North German writers is Georg Hermann, whose *Jettchen Gebert* is, undoubtedly, one of the best modern German novels.

The brothers Heinrich and Thomas Mann occupy a position by themselves. Martens is more penetrating in his characterisation of them, Soergel the more comprehensive. The latter points to the influence of Thackeray on Thomas Mann, but he might easily have said more on this point. Possibly there is also an influence of Ibsen on *Buddenbrooks*, the best German novel of the last decade. The other novelists of the time are adequately treated by Soergel, but some mention might have been made of Wette, as well as of G. O. Knoop, who is sympathetically appreciated by Martens. Among the names which Soergel mentions in the introduction to the drama of this period, a few might have been more fully discussed such as Eduard Stucken, Heinrich Lilienfein, a dramatist of real talent, and Friedrich Freksa.

How unsettled aesthetic taste in Germany was at the beginning of the last decade is seen in the adaptation of the French Montmartre cabaret as the German 'Überbrettl,' in which Pollard finds so much to praise. But in its aesthetic pretensions the 'Überbrettl' seems to us to have been an utter failure. One of its chief personalities is Frank Wedekind, of whom Martens gives an excellent characterisation; and Wedekind, with all his extravagances a really gifted dramatist, has outlived the 'Überbrettl.' Of Karl Schönherr and Fritz Stavenhagen, the latter seems to us to have been the more original; one cannot regard Schönherr's *Glaube und Heimat* as *the* great tragedy, but Stavenhagen had, in our opinion, given promise of filling a long felt gap in German comedy. There is, further, a neo-romantic and a neo-classic group of poets. To the former belongs Ernst Hardt, whose *Tantris der Narr* never surely deserved the 'Schillerpreis'; to the latter belong Paul Ernst, Wilhelm von Scholz and others. But they are all merely eclectics and experimentalists. Soergel, as well as Martens, concludes with a study on that promising young dramatist Herbert Eulenberg.

Something might have been said on the subject of literary theories in the period under consideration, a matter which is well and fully treated by Soergel; and we must certainly not omit to express our gratitude for the many and well-chosen illustrations in his book.

An index of the artists would be useful in a second edition, where, too, the style might be improved here and there and the numerous misprints corrected.

Professor Witkowski's *Die Entwicklung der deutschen Literatur seit* 1830 is not, he tells us, intended to compete with other histories of modern German literature; its particular aim is 'den Lesern Hilfe bei der Wahl der Bücher und zum Genuss und Urteil zu bieten.' But he has by no means restricted himself to this purpose; his lucid treatise strikes out new paths and brings vividly before us the literary development since 1830. The important stages are well defined and due attention given to the various foreign influences. His characterisation of individual authors and of the general trend of thought within special periods is concise and suggestive, although, owing to the limitations of space, naturally somewhat dogmatic. We note particularly the warm appreciation of Lenau and Spitteler, the impartial estimate of Ferdinand Avenarius, the clear discussion of realism (pp. 35 ff.) and of the 'Zeitstimmung' after 1850 (pp. 43 ff.). There are only a few points in which we differ from Professor Witkowski, as, for instance, his too severe criticism of Hugo von Hofmannsthal; we should have wished, too, for a more ample treatment of Wilhelm von Polenz, and surely Vischer's novel *Auch Einer* ought to have been mentioned in the text. The book is supplied with elaborate and valuable notes, which include even so recent a date as the death of Felix Dahn last January. Perhaps it might be added to p. 51 that Adolf Hausrath died some years ago; on p. 64 reference might have been made to the excellent essay by O. F. Walzel on Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach (*Aufsätze*, 1811), and on p. 131 to the book by Kurt Martens which has just been reviewed. But these are trifles. The book leaves the impression on us that Witkowski is singularly well equipped for the task he has undertaken.

Karl Holl.

Liverpool.

MINOR NOTICES.

The first part (*Inferno*) of this useful work (*Dante's Divina Commedia*, edited and annotated by C. H. Grandgent. London: D. C. Heath and Co.) was reviewed in these pages rather more than a year ago (Vol. v, pp. 124—6). Professor Grandgent now gives us the *Purgatorio* on the same plan. As the previous volume was noticed at some length, we will confine ourselves on the present occasion to a few remarks suggested in the course of a first reading. In a note on i. 19—21, the editor gives a reference to Dr Moore's article in this *Review* (Vol. iii, pp. 376 ff.) on the almanack of Profacius, but he omits to mention the all-important point that by the discovery of this

almanack the chief obstacle to the acceptance of the year 1300 as the date of Dante's vision has been removed. The objection, or one of the objections, to taking *indico legno* (VII, 74) to be amber, and not indigo, as is usually supposed, is that yellow is already represented by *oro* (l. 73), and that blue is wanted to complete the colour-gamut. *Vista* (X, 67) is used, we think, in the sense of 'aperture,' as in *Inf.* X, 52 (here 'window'), rather than in that of 'view point,' 'outlook.' In the argument to canto XII, where Professor Grandgent draws attention to the fivefold repetition of the initials VOM in the terzine comprised in ll. 25—63, he fails to note the suggestion as to the peculiar significance of the word thus formed (namely *uom*, i.e. 'man') which is recorded in Dr Moore's *Studies in Dante* (II, 268). In the note on XXIV, 30, we are told that Dante's use of the term *rocco* for the pastoral staff of the Archbishop of Ravenna is 'unexplained.' It was explained by one of the earliest of the commentators on the *Commedia*, viz. Jacopo della Lana, whose explanation is given in the *Dante Dictionary* (s.v. *Bonifazio*[2]), with a reference to a work of Corrado Ricci, in which there is an illustration of the very *rocco* mentioned by Dante. Ananias and Sapphira are stated (XX, 112) to have sold a piece of land 'belonging to the apostles'; but the 'possession' was their own, as is clear from the words of Peter to Ananias (*Acts* V, 4).

Professor Grandgent has profited by our previous remarks to the extent of recognizing later editions of some of the commentaries of which he has made use; but the glaring misprint '*Via Nuova*' to which we drew attention still disfigures the page of abbreviations. The only other misprint we have noticed is *Ugguccione* on p. 227. An excellent feature of the work, which we omitted to mention in our former review, is the list of authorities at the end of the 'argument' to each canto. We are glad to see a reference to Mr W. H. V. Reade's *Moral System of Dante's Inferno*, an original contribution to Dantesque literature which is not so well known to Dantists outside this country as it should be. In a future issue a reference might be added (on p. 179) to the two suggestive articles on Dante and Statius contributed by Dr A. W. Verrall to the *Independent Review* for Nov. 1903 ('To follow the Fisherman') and the *Albany Review* for August 1908 ('Dante on the Baptism of Statius'), with which Professor Grandgent does not seem to be acquainted.

P. T.

It is obviously somewhat late to discuss now the merits and shortcomings of Mr Collison-Morley's *Giuseppe Baretti with an account of his Literary Friendships and Feuds in Italy and in England in the days of Dr Johnson* (London: John Murray, 1909), especially since a very full review of it has appeared from the pen of Luigi Piccioni (*Giornale storico della Letteratura italiana*, LVII, pp. 94 ff.), one of the most competent authorities on this subject. The author does not lay any claim to first-hand research about Baretti's Italian life, so that for

the scholar a considerable portion of the book is of little value, being merely founded on works published in Italy. Mr Marion Crawford, who supplied the preface, thought Italians too prone to forget that a great part of Baretti's life was spent in England, and even more that much of his literary work was written in a language which he possessed almost to perfection. There may be some exaggeration in this; yet there was certainly room for a good work on Baretti's life in England. Unfortunately the author has not felt the need of much independent investigation, so that, notwithstanding a certain number of fresh facts which he supplies, he cannot be said to have exhausted the subject and to have rendered further discoveries improbable. As Baretti was connected with Dr Johnson, Mrs Thrale and their friends, there was a certain inducement to draw into the work much that was not essential to it; nor has the author always withstood the inducement. So that from a mere scholar's point of view the critic's verdict would not go in favour of the present work. It would, however, be decidedly unfair to consider the book solely from such a standpoint, as it aims at bringing to the notice of a wider range of readers the life and works of a writer who possessed three living languages, who had an undeniable influence on the development of Italian literature and who did not shrink from attacking Voltaire in defence of Shakespeare. This book provides the general reader, or at least the reader interested in literary history, with a considerable amount of information in agreeable form.

C. F.

From the Oxford University Press we have two interesting and useful reprints, *Burns, Poems published in* 1786, a type-facsimile reproduction of the Kilmarnock edition, and *Lyrical Ballads*, 1798, edited, with an introductory note, by Professor Littledale. These two books are among the landmarks in the history of English poetry, and it is a great thing for students of literature to have them available in a trustworthy form and at a reasonable price. In order to appreciate the effect which was produced upon contemporary readers we must make sure that we know precisely what the contents of the volumes were, and for this purpose nothing will take the place of the books themselves; for apart from the question of differences of text, we can never satisfactorily reconstruct them by picking out the poems which composed them out of the collection of the author's works. It is true that we already have two reprints of the *Lyrical Ballads*, and both Mr Hutchinson's and Professor Dowden's are valuable books for the editorial matter which they contain; but the new Oxford edition is cheaper than either, and the text after all is the main thing.

G. C. M.

Mr Maurice Hare edits a reprint of Chatterton's Rowley Poems from Tyrwhitt's edition (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1911), with the Appendix which was added in 1778, 'containing some observations upon

the language of the poems attributed to Rowley, tending to prove that they were written, not by any ancient author, but entirely by Thomas Chatterton.' Mr Hare gives us a biography of Chatterton and an account of the genesis of the Rowley poems, which are fairly satisfactory, but his literary criticism is not of much independent value, and from remarks casually thrown out one gathers that he has rather misty ideas both of the manners of the Middle Ages and of the literary tendencies of the eighteenth century. Moreover, such expressions as 'very interested' are not yet good English.

The text is printed page for page from Tyrwhitt's, and is an excellent reproduction of the original as regards form and type: the Glossary is Tyrwhitt's also, but with additions by the present editor. It may be noted that though the editor has corrected some of the false references, yet some still remain, as for example under the headings 'Adave,' 'After la goure,' 'Behight,' 'Geer.' Tyrwhitt's Appendix is an excellent piece of criticism, and though the examination which it contains of the language of the Rowley poems has been further developed in our own time, the author was fully justified in claiming that he had proved his case. The motto from Virgil which stands upon the title-page of this Appendix was finely selected:

> Tum levis haud ultra latebras jam quærit imago,
> Sed sublime volans nocti se immiscuit atræ.

G. C. M.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

March—May, 1912.

GENERAL.

Arnold, R. F., Das moderne Drama. 2nd ed. Strassburg. Trübner. 6 M.

Bastide, C., Anglais et Français du XVII^e siècle. Paris, Alcan. 4 fr.

Festschrift, Vilhelm Thomsen zur Vollendung des 70. Lebensjahres dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern. Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 10 M.

Finsler, G., Homer in der Neuzeit von Dante bis Goethe. Italien, Frankreich, England, Deutschland. Leipzig, Teubner. 12 M.

Hall, H. M., Idylls of Fishermen. A History of the Literary Species (Columbia Univ. Studies in Comparative Literature). New York, Columbia Univ. Press. 1 dol. 50.

Hinneberg, P., Die Kultur der Gegenwart, herausg. von. 2nd edition. I, i, Die allgemeinen Grundlagen der Kultur der Gegenwart. Leipzig, Teubner. 18 M.

Holl, K., Zur Geschichte der Lustspieltheorie. I. Entwicklungsgeschichte, in Einzelvertretern dargestellt bis Gottsched. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, XLIV.) Berlin, E. Felber. 3 M. 20.

Jespersen, O., Elementarbuch der Phonetik. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 M. 60.

Lalo, C., Introduction à l'esthétique. Paris, A. Colin. 3 fr. 50.

Neilson, W. A., The Essentials of Poetry. London, Constable. 5*s.* net.

Sievers, E., Rhythmisch-melodische Studien. Vorträge und Aufsätze. (Germanische Bibliothek, II. Abt., V.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 3 M. 20.

Tyroller, F., Die Fabel von dem Mann und dem Vogel in ihrer Verbreitung in der Weltliteratur. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, LI.) Berlin, E. Felber. 10 M.

Woodberry, G. E., Great writers : Cervantes, Scott, Milton, Virgil, Montaigne, Shakespeare. London, Macmillan. 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

Woodberry, G. E., The Torch. Eight lectures on Race power in Literature. London, Macmillan. 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Alexander, L. H., Participial Substantives of the -ata Type in the Romance Languages with special reference to French (Columbia Univ. Studies in Romance Philology and Literature). New York, Columbia Univ. Press.

Bibliotheca romanica. 146—148. Boccaccio, Il Filostrato ; 149—150. Salas Barbadillo, Alonso Jerónimo : Novelas. La hija de Celestina. La ingeniosa Elena ; 151—153. Cervantes Saavedra, Don Quijote (1, b.) ; Boccaccio, Il Corbaccio o il laberinto d' amore. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. Each number 40 pf.

Schröder, T., Die dramatischen Bearbeitungen der Don Juan-Sage in Spanien, Italien und Frankreich bis auf Molière einschliesslich. (Zeitschrift für roman. Phil., Beihefte, XXXVI.) Halle, Niemeyer. 8 M.

Latin.

Frischlinus, N., Julius redivivus. Herausg. von W. Janell. (Lateinische Literaturdenkmale des xv. und xvi. Jahrh., xix.) Berlin, Wiedmann. 5 M.

Historia septem sapientum. i. Eine bisher unbekannte lateinische Übersetzung einer orientalischen Fassung der sieben weisen Meister (Mischle Sendabar), herausg. von A. Hilka. (Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte, iv.) Heidelberg, Winter. 1 M. 20.

Schneiderhan, J., Roswitha von Gandersheim, die erste deutsche Dichterin. Paderborn, Bonifacius-Druckerei. 3 M. 30.

Vollert, K., Zur Geschichte der lateinischen Facetiensammlungen des xv. und xvi. Jahrhunderts. (Palaestra, cxiii.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 3 M. 60.

Werner, J., Lateinische Sprichwörter und Sinnsprüche des Mittelalters. (Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte, iii.) Heidelberg, Winter. 2 M. 20.

Italian.

Azzolina, L., Il mondo cavalleresco in Bojardo, Ariosto e Berni. Palermo, A. Reber. 3 L.

Burgos, C. de, G. Leopardi, Su vida y sus obras. 2 vols. Valencia, Sempere. 6 pes.

Busnelli, G., Il concetto e l' ordine del Paradiso dantesco. ii. (Collezione di opuscoli danteschi inediti o rari, 110—113.) Città di Castello, S. Lapi. 3 L. 20.

Carducci, G., Opere. Edizione popolare. i. Juvenilia (1850—60). ii. Rime nuove (1861—87). Bologna, Zanichelli. Each 2 L. 50.

Cavalcanti, G., Sonnets and Ballate. With Translations and an Introduction by E. Pound. London, Swift. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Cecchi, E., La poesia di Giovanni Pascoli: saggio critico. Naples, Ricciardi. 2 L.

Dorini, U., Contributi alla biografia di Dante; la condizione economica del poeta e della famiglia: documenti e note. Florence, G. Carnesecchi. 5 L.

Franzoni, A. and Turchi, E., Per lo studio di Dante. i. Vita di Dante. ii. Preparazione allo studio di Dante. Rome, Soc. editr. Dante Alighieri. 1 L. 25.

Ladenarda, F. E., Feticisti Carduccini, con lettere di M. Rapisardi e P. Gauthiez. Palermo, G. Pedone-Lauriel. 3 L. 50.

Mazzini, G., Scritti e ricordi autobiografici: scelta con note storiche a cura di A. Donati. Rome, Soc. editr. Dante Alighieri. 3 L.

Passerini, G. L., Il vocabolario della poesia dannunziana. Con una epistola a G. D' Annunzio. Florence, Sansoni. 4 L.

Poliziano, A., Le stanze, l' Orfeo e le rime rivedute da G. Carducci. 2da ediz. a cura di G. Mazzoni e G. Rossi. Bologna, Zanichelli. 10 L.

Schmelzer, H., Petrarcas Verhältnis zur vorausgehenden christlichen Philosophie des Abendlandes. (Renaissance und Philosophie, vi.) Bonn, P. Hanstein. 1 M. 50.

Villari, P., Scritti vari. Bologna, Zanichelli. 5 L.

Zanella, G., Poesie, con prefazione di A. Graf. Nuova ediz. 2 vols. Florence, Le Monnier. 4 L.

Rhaeto-romanic.

Decurtius, C., Rätoromanische Chrestomathie. iv. Band. Surselvisch, Subselvisch, Volksmedizin, Nachträge. Erlangen, F. Junge. 36 M.

Provençal.

Chaytor, H. J., The Troubadours. (Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature.) Cambridge, Univ. Press. 1*s.* net.

La Salle de Rochemaure, Duc de, Les troubadours cantaliens du xii^e^ au xx^e^ siècle. 2 vols. (Bibl. régionaliste.) Paris, Bloud. 7 fr.

Pagès, A., Aunias March et ses prédécesseurs. Essai sur la poésie amoureuse et philosophique en Catalogne aux xiv^e^ et xv^e^ siècles. (Bibl. de l'École des hautes-études, fasc. 194.) Paris, Champion. 10 fr. 50.

Spanish.

Adam, J., Übersetzung und Glossar des altspanischen Poema del Cid. (Aus 'Romanische Forschungen.') Erlangen, F. Junge. 6 M.

Cotarelo y Mori, E., Don Francisco de Rojas Zorilla. Noticias bibliográficas y biográficas. Madrid, Rev. de Archivos. 4 pes.

Menéndez Pidal, R., Cantar de Mio Cid. Texto, gramática y vocabulario. iii. Madrid, Bailly-Baillière. 10 pes.

Torres Villarroel, Vida, ed. F. de Onis (Clasicos Castellanos, vii). Madrid, Ediciones de 'La Lectura' (Paris, Champion). 4 pes.

French.

(*a*) *General.*

Balcke, C., Der anorganische Nasallaut im Französischen. (Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie. Beihefte, xxxix.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M.

Wright, C. H. C., A History of French Literature. New York, Oxford Univ. Press (London, H. Frowde). 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

(*b*) *Old French.*

Adam le Bossu, trouvère artésien du xiii^e^ siècle. Le jeu de la Feuillée, ed. par E. Langlois. (Les classiques français du moyen âge.) Paris, H. Champion. 2 fr.

Bédier, J., Les chansons de Colin Muset, transcription des mélodies par J. Beck. (Les classiques français du moyen âge.) Paris, Champion. 1 fr. 50.

Chansonnier, Le, de l'Arsenal. Trouvères des xii^e^ et xiii^e^ siècles, reproduits du manuscrit de la Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal. Transcription du texte musical en notation moderne par P. Aubry, introd. et notices par A. Jeanroy. Fasc. 8 et 9. Paris, P. Genthner. 20 fr.

Ott, A. C., Das altfranzösische Eustachiusleben der Pariser Handschrift Nat. Bibl. fr. 1374, zum ersten Male mit Einleitung, den lateinischen Texten der 'Acta Sanctorum' und der 'Bibliotheca Casinensis,' Anmerkungen und Glossar herausg. (Aus 'Romanische Forschungen.') Erlangen, F. Junge. 4 M.

(*c*) *Modern French.*

Allem, M., Alfred de Vigny (La vie anecdotique et pittoresque des grands écrivains). Paris, L. Michaud. 2 fr. 25.

Allem, M., L'épopée napoléonienne dans la poésie française. Textes choisis et annotés. Paris, Libr. des Annales. 7 fr.

Balzac, H. de, La comédie humaine, texte revisé et annoté par M. Bouteron et H. Longnon. Tome i, ii. Paris, L. Conard. Each 9 fr.

Bayle, P., Pensées diverses sur la comète, édit. critique avec introd. et notes par A. Prat. Tome i. (Société des textes français modernes.) Paris, E. Cornély. 6 fr.

Bernard, G., L'imitation espagnole en France. Les modèles castillans de nos grands écrivains français, étude et analyse. Tourcoing, Duvivier. 3 fr.

Brizeux, A., Œuvres. Nouvelle édition. Tome iv. Paris, Garnier. 3 fr.

Caussy, F., Voltaire, seigneur de village. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Chateaubriand, F. R. de, Napoléon. Préface et notes par M. Dreyfous. Nouvelle édition. Paris, Flammarion. 7 fr. 50.

Cochin, H., Lamartine et la Flandre. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 5 fr.

Drouet, J., L'abbé de Saint-Pierre. L'homme et l'œuvre. Paris, Champion. 7 fr. 50.

Faguet, E., Rousseau contre Molière. Paris, Société franc. d'impr. et de libr 3 fr. 50.

Fleischmann, H., Victor Hugo, Waterloo, Napoléon, recueil de documents inédits ou nouveaux publiés ou annotés. Paris, Méricant. 3 fr. 50.

Köwer, C., Stendhal und der Ausdruck der Gemütsbewegungen in seinen Werken. (Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, Beihefte. xxxv.) Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M.

Lardeur, J. B., La vérité psychologique et morale dans les romans de Paul Bourget. Paris, Fontemoing. 2 fr.

Laurentie, F., Sur Barbey d'Aurévilly. Paris, Émile Paul. 3 fr. 50.

Legouis, É., Défense de la poésie française, à l'usage des lecteurs anglais. Paris, Hachette. (London, Constable.) 6 fr.

Lévi-Malvano, Montesquieu et Machiavelli. (Bibl. de l'Institut français de Florence, Tome ii.) Paris, H. Champion. 5 fr.

Mansuy, A., Le monde slave et les classiques français aux xvi—xvii[e] siècles. Paris, Champion. 10 fr.

Martinon, P., Les Strophes. Étude historique et critique sur les formes de la poésie lyrique en France depuis la Renaissance, avec une bibliographie. Paris, H. Champion. 15 fr.

Maurras, Ch., Trois idées politiques, Chateaubriand, Michelet, Sainte-Beuve. Nouv. édit. Paris, H. Champion. 2 fr.

Noel, C. M., Les idées sociales dans le théâtre de A. Dumas fils. Paris, Messein. 5 fr.

Plan, P. P., J. J. Rousseau raconté par les gazettes de son temps. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

Rabelais, F., Gargantua. Édition critique publ. par A. Lefranc. Tome i. Paris, H. Champion. 15 fr.

Séché, A., Les accents de la satire dans la poésie contemporaine. Paris, E. Sansot. 3 fr. 50.

Séché, L., Le cénacle de Joseph Delorme (1827–30). Tome i—ii. Paris, Mercure de France. 15 fr.

Stauf von der March, O., Victor Hugo. Eine Würdigung. Pankow-Berlin, Elsner. 2 M.

Strowski, F., Tableau de la littérature française au xix[e] siècle. Paris, Delaplane. 3 fr. 50.

Vey, E., Le ballet forésien de 1605, suivi d'extraits en prose de la Gazette française en dialecte de Saint-Étienne. Paris, Champion. 4 fr.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Scandinavian.

Aasen, I., Skrifter i Samling. Trykt og utrykt. 2.—11. Hefte. Copenhagen. Gyldendal. Each 50 ö.

Bang, H., Værker i Mindeudgave. 1.—8. Hefte. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. Each 50 ö.

Castrén, G., Johan Ludvig Runeberg. (Sveriges Nationallitteratur, xxv.) Stockholm, Beijer. 2 kr.

Feuk, M., Lidners poetiska språk. En Stilstudie. Lund, Gleerupska bogh. 2 Kr. 50.

Hesselman, B., Västnordiska studier. I. Om brytningen. Uppsala, Akad. bokh. 2 Kr.

Ibsen, H., Works. Vol. XII. From Ibsen's Workshop. London, Heinemann. 4*s*.

Dutch, Frisian, Low German.

Dornfeld, E., Untersuchungen zu Gottfried Hagen's Reimchronik der Stadt Köln, nebst Beiträgen zur mittelripuarischen Grammatik. (Germanistische Abhandlungen, XL.) Breslau, M. and H. Marcus. 10 M. 80.

Dunkmann, A., Ostfriesisch-plattdeutsches Dichterbuch. Mit einer Einleitung: Geschichte der niederdeutschen Sprache und Literatur in Ostfriesland. Aurich, Dunkmann. 3 M.

Kalff, G., Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche letterkunde. VII. Groningen, J. B. Wolter. 6 fl. 50.

Müller, J. C., Memoriale linguae frisicae. Nach der Jeverschen Orig.-Handschrift herausg. von E. König. (Verein für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung, IV. Band.) Norden, D. Soltau. 6 M. 40.

English.

(*a*) *General* (Language).

Jespersen, O., Growth and Structure of the English Language. 2nd ed. Leipzig, Teubner. 1.

Smith, L. P., The English Language. (Home University Library.) London, Williams and Norgate. 1*s*. net.

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

Bramis, J., Historia regis Waldei. Herausg. von R. Imelmann. (Bonner Studien zur engl. Philologie, IV.) Bonn, P. Hanstein. 10 M.

Chadwick, H. M., The Heroic Age. Cambridge, University Press. 12*s*. net.

Chambers, R. W., Widsith. A Study in Old English Heroic Legend. Cambridge, University Press. 10*s*. net.

Gabrielson, A., The Influence of *W-* in Old English as seen in the Middle English Dialects. Göteborg, Eranos' Förlag.

Grein, C. W. M., Sprachschatz der angelsächsischen Dichter. Unter Mitwirkung von F. Holthausen neu herausg. von J. J. Köhler. 1.—2. Lieferung. (Germanistische Bibliothek. IV. Reihe. Wörterbücher. IV, 1, 2.) Heidelberg, Winter. 1 M. 50.

Grein, C. W. M., Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa. VIII. Band, I. Teil. Das Epinaler und Erfurter Glossar. Neu herausg. von O. B. Schlutter. I. Faksimile und Transliteration des Epinaler Glossars. Hamburg, H. Grand. 8 M.

Ker, W. P., English Literature: Mediaeval. (Home University Library.) London, Williams and Norgate. 1*s*. net.

Kolbe, T., Die Konjugation der Lindisfarner Evangelien. Ein Beitrag zur altenglischen Grammatik. (Bonner Studien zur englischen Philologie, V.) Bonn, P. Hanstein. 5 M.

(*c*) *Modern English.*

Becker, F., Bryan Waller Procter (Barry Cornwall). (Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, XXXVII.) Vienna, Braumüller. 4 M. 50.

Bradsher, E. L., Mathew Carey, Editor, Author and Publisher. (Columbia Univ. Studies in English.) New York, Columbia Univ. Press. (London, H. Frowde.) 5*s*. 6*d*. net.

Brown, M. J., Historical Ballad Poetry of Ireland. Dublin, Educational Co. of Ireland. 3*s*. 6*d*.

Browning, R., Works. With Introductions by F. G. Kenyon. (Centenary Edition.) Vol. I. London, Smith Elder. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Browning, R., The Centenary Celebration at Westminster Abbey, May 7, 1912. Edited by Prof. Knight. London, Smith Elder. 2*s.* net.

Byroniana und anderes aus dem englischen Seminar in Erlangen. Erlangen, M. Mencke. 1 M. 60.

Cambridge History of English Literature, The. Vol. VIII. The Age of Dryden. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 9*s.* net.

Collins, J. C., Posthumous Essays. Edited by L. C. Collins. London, Dent. 6*s.* net.

Cowl, R. P., An Anthology of Imaginative Prose. London, Herbert and Daniel. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Daffis, H., Hamlet auf der deutschen Bühne bis zur Gegenwart. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, L.) Berlin, E. Felber. 3 M.

Donady, J., La mer et les poètes anglais. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Fyfe, T. A., Who's who in Dickens : a complete Dickens repertory in Dickens' own words. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 6*s.* net.

Henderson, T. F., The Ballad in Literature. (Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature.) Cambridge, Univ. Press. 1*s.* net.

Jonson, B., Cynthia's Revels, ed. with Introduction, Notes and Glossary by A. C. Judson. (Yale Studies in English, XLV.) New York, H. Holt & Co.

Köhler, B., Die Schilderung des Milieus in Shakespeares Hamlet, Macbeth und King Lear. (Studien zur englischen Philologie, XLVI.) Halle, Niemeyer. 2 M. 40.

Koeppel, E., Robert Browning. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, XLVIII.) Berlin, E. Felber. 5 M.

Langdon, I., Materials for a Study of Spenser's Theory of Fine Art. Ithaca, New York.

Lawrence, W. J., The Elizabethan Playhouse and other Studies. London, A. H. Bullen. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Leschtsch, A., Der Humor Falstaffs. (Neue Shakespeare-Bühne, X.) Berlin, H. Paetel. 3 M.

Lohr, P., Le printemps d'Yver und die Quelle zu Fair Em. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, XLIX.) Berlin, E. Felber. 1 M. 50.

Makower, S. V. and Blackwell, B. H., A Book of English Essays, 1600–1900. (World's Classics.) London, H. Frowde. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

Menaechmi, The : the original of Shakespeare's Comedy of Errors. The Latin text together with the Elizabethan translation, ed. by W. H. D. Rouse. London, Chatto and Windus. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Mosher, J. A., The Exemplum in the Early Religious and Didactic Literature of England. (Columbia University Studies in English.) New York, Columbia Univ. Press. (London, H. Frowde.) 5*s.* 6*d.* net.

Notestein, W., A History of Witchcraft in England, 1558–1718. Washington, American Historical Association. 1 dol. 50.

Owen, D. L., Piers Plowman : a Comparison with some earlier and contemporary French Allegories. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 5*s.* net.

Prinz, J., A Tale of a Prioress and her three Wooers. Text mit Einleitung. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, XLVII.) Berlin, E. Felber. 5 M.

Rich, B., Apolonius and Silla : an original of Shakespeare's 'Twelfth Night.' Edited by M. Luce. London, Chatto and Windus. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Roz, F., Le Roman anglais contemporain. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

Shelley, P. B., Prose Works. Reprinted from the original editions and edited by R. H. Shepherd. 2 vols. London, Chatto and Windus. 4*s.* net.

Swift, J., Correspondence. Edited by F. E. Ball. Vol. III. London, G. Bell. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Wolff, S. F., The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction. (Columbia University Studies in Comparative Literature.) New York, Columbia Univ. Press. (London, H. Frowde.) 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Woodberry, G. E., Swinburne. London, Macmillan. 5*s.* net.

German.

(*a*) *General.*

Boehme, G., Neudeutsche Grammatik oder Reformdeutsch. Ein Versuch, die deutsche Sprache zu vereinfachen und zugleich weiter auszubauen. Tübingen, A. und S. Weil. 4 M. 50.

Collitz, H., Das schwache Präteritum und seine Vorgeschichte. (Hesperia, I.) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 8 M.

Müller-Fraureuth, K., Wörterbuch der obersächsischen und erzgebirgischen Mundarten. 5. Lieferung. Dresden, W. Baensch. 3 M. 50.

Riesenfeld, P., Heinrich von Ofterdingen in der deutschen Literatur. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 7 M.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

Kraus, C. von, Mittelhochdeutsches Übungsbuch. (Sammlung germanischer Elementar- und Handbücher. III. Reihe. Lesebücher, II.) Heidelberg, Winter. 3 M. 60.

Michiels, H., Über englische Bestandteile altdeutscher Glossenhandschriften. Bonn, Hanstein. 3 M.

Vignola, B., Il poema dei Nibelungi : appunti di critica e di estetica. Verona, R. Cabianca. 2 L. 50.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

Bartscherer, A., Zur Kenntnis des jungen Goethe. Drei Abhandlungen. Dortmund, F. W. Ruhfus. 4 M. 50.

Blanc, M., Étude littéraire sur les élégies romaines de Goethe. Paris, Berger-Levraut. 3 fr. 50.

Bleibtreu, C., Geschichte der deutschen Nationalliteratur von Goethes Tod bis zur Gegenwart, herausg. von G. Gellert. Berlin, W. Herlet. 3 M.

Börne, L., Werke. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe in 12 Bänden. Herausg. von L. Geiger. Vols. I—III. Berlin, Bong und Co. Each 2 M.

Bötcher, E., Goethes Singspiele 'Erwin und Elmire' und 'Claudine von Villa Bella' und die 'opera buffa.' Marburg, N. G. Elwert. 3 M.

Breitner, A., Joseph Viktor von Scheffel und seine Literatur. Bayreuth, B. Seligsberg. 12 M.

Eiermann, W., Gellerts Briefstil. (Teutonia, XXIII.) Leipzig, Avenarius. 3 M. 50.

Fries, A., Stilistische Beobachtungen zu Wilhelm Meister, mit Proben angewandter Ästhetik. (Berliner Beiträge zur germanischen und romanischen Philologie, XLIV.) Berlin, E. Ebering. 2 M. 80.

Germany in the Nineteenth Century. Five Lectures by various authors. Manchester, Sherratt and Hughes. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Goethe, J. W. von, Ausgewählte Gespräche. Volksausgabe. Herausg. von F. von Biedermann. Leipzig, Hesse und Becker. 2 M. 50.

Goethe, J. W. von, Werke. Herausg. im Auftrage der Grossherzogin Sophie von Sachsen. IV. Abt., 50. Band. Nachträge und Undatiertes. Weimar, Böhlau. 8 M. 80.

Goethe, J. W. von, Werke. Grossherzog Wilhelm Ernst-Ausgabe. x (Kunstschriften, ii) und xi (Übersetzungen). Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 6 M. and 6 M. 50.

Grillparzer, F., Werke. Herausg. von A. Sauer. ii. Abt., 1. Band. (Jugendwerke, i.) Vienna, Gerlach und Wiedling. 7 M. 20.

Hagen, E. von dem, Goethe als Herausgeber von 'Kunst und Alterthum' und seine Mitarbeiter. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M. 50.

Hammes, F., Das Zwischenspiel im deutschen Drama von seinen Anfängen bis auf Gottsched. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, xlv.) Berlin, E. Felber. 5 M.

Hargrave, M., Some German Women and their Salons. London, Laurie. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Haertel, W., Johann von Besser. Sein Leben und seine Werke. (Literarhistorische Forschungen, xlvi.) Berlin, E. Felber. 4 M.

Henze, H., Die Allegorie bei Hans Sachs. (Hermaea, xi.) Halle, Niemeyer. 8 M.

Kettner, G., Goethes Drama 'Die natürliche Tochter.' Berlin, Weidmann. 3 M. 40.

Kleist, H. von, Gespräche. Nachrichten und Überlieferungen aus seinem Umgange. Herausg. von F. von Biedermann. Leipzig, Hesse und Becker. 2 M. 50.

Kofink, H., Lessings Anschauungen über die Unsterblichkeit und Seelenwanderung. Strassburg, Trübner. 6 M.

Krebs, W., Friedrich von Matthisson (1761–1831). Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 3 M. 60.

Kühlhorn, W., J. A. Leisewitzens Julius von Tarent. Erläuterung und literarhistorische Würdigung. (Bausteine zur Geschichte der neueren deutschen Literatur, x.) Halle, Niemeyer. 2 M. 80.

Lessing, O. E., Masters in Modern German Literature. Dresden, Reissner. 4 M.

McCabe, J., Goethe, the Man and his Character. London, Nash. 15*s.* net.

Mangold, H. W., Studien zu den ältesten Bühnenverdeutschungen des Terenz. (Hermaea, x.) Halle, Niemeyer. 6 M. 40.

Penny, A. J., Studies in Jacob Böhme. London, Watkins. 6*s.* net.

Reinecke, C., Studien zu Halms Erzählungen und ihrer Technik. (Sprache und Dichtung, ix.) Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr. 2 M. 50.

Robertson, J. G., Goethe and the Twentieth Century. (Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature.) Cambridge, Univ. Press. 1*s.* net.

Scharrer-Santen, E., A. Wilbrandt als Dramatiker. Munich, H. Sachs-Verlag. 3 M. 50.

Scholte, J. H., Probleme der Grimmelshausenforschung. i. Groningen, J. B. Wolter. 2 fl. 40.

Siuts, H., Jenseitsmotive im deutschen Volksmärchen. (Teutonia, xix.) Leipzig, E. Avenarius. 8 M.

Stifter, A., Sämtliche Werke. iv. Bd. 1. und 2. Teil. Herausg. von L. Müller und S. Nadler. (Bibl. deutscher Schriftsteller aus Böhmen, xxiii, xxiv.) Prague, J. G. Calve. Each 6 Kr.

Tonnelat, E., Les Contes des frères Grimm. Étude sur la composition et le style du recueil des Kinder- und Hausmärchen. Paris, A. Colin. 10 fr.

Tonnelat, E., Les frères Grimm. Leur œuvre de jeunesse. Paris, A. Colin. 7 fr. 50.

Voigt, J., Goethe und Ilmenau. Leipzig, Xenien-Verlag. 5 M.

Witte, E., Falk und Goethe. Rostock, H. Warkentien. 3 M.

Wolff, J., Sämtliche Werke. Herausg. von J. Lauff. i. Serie. i. Band. Leipzig, P. List. 3 M.

Wüstling, F., Tiecks William Lovell. (Bausteine zur Geschichte der neueren deutschen Literatur, vii.) Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M.